

# **भारत का राजपत्र** **The Gazette of India**

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
**PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY**

सं० २५] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जून २०, १९७०/ज्येष्ठ ३०, १८९२  
 No. 25] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1970/ JYAISTHA 30, 1892

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह भ्रमल संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड ३—उपखण्ड (ii)

**PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)**

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किये गये विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

## **ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA**

### **ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 13th May 1970*

S.O. 2149.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sri Raja Kali Pada Singha Thakur, Darbar, P.O. Bishnupur District Bankura (West Bengal) a contesting candidate for the mid-term election held in February, 1969, to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 240-Vishnupur constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder.

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sri Raja Kali Pada Singha Thakur to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/240/69(16).]

By Order,

A. N. SEN, Secy.

## भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 मई, 1970

एस०ओ० 2149:—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिए 240, विष्णुपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राजाकाली पद सिंह ठाकुर दरबार, पो० आ० विष्णुपुर, जिला बाँकुरा (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा एतद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा भण्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री राजाकालीपद सिंह ठाकुर को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० प० ब०-वि० सं०/240/69(16)]

आदेश से,

एस० एन० मुखर्जी, सचिव ।

## ORDERS

New Delhi, the 14th May 1970

S.O. 2150.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Singray Murmu, R/O village Ambadiha, P.O. Mahadeoganj, District Santhal Parganas (Bihar), a contesting candidate for the mid-term election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in February, 1969 from Borio Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Singray Murmu to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/140/69(91).]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 14 मई 1970

एस०ओ० 2150.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार विधान सभा के लिये फरवरी, 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिये बोरियो निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव

लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सिंगराय मुरम् निवासी ग्राम अ बाबिहा लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे समयक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री सिंगराय मुरम् को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/140/69/(91)]

**S.O. 2151.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Bahadur Hembrom, R/O village Tal Pahari, P.O. Dangapara, District Santhal Parganas (Bihar), a contesting candidate for the mid-term election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in February, 1969 from Litipara Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Bahadur Hembrom to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/142/69(92).]

**एस० श्री० 2151:**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार विधान सभा के लिये फरवरी, 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिये लिपिपाड़ा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बहादुर हेम्बरम निवासी ग्राम लालपहाड़ी, पो० आ० डंगा पाड़ा, जिला संताल परगना (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे समयक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री बहादुर हेम्बरम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/142/69(92)]

New Delhi, the 26th May 1970

**S.O. 2152.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kameshwar Sharma, R/O Village Nagain, P.O. Singhari via Goh, District Gaya (Bihar), a contesting candidate for the mid-term election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in February, 1969 from Goh Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kameshwar Sharma, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/239/69(93).]

नई दिल्ली, 26 मई, 1970

**एस०आ० 2152:**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार विधान सभा के लिए फरवरी, 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिए 239-गोह निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कामेश्वर शर्मा, निवासी ग्राम-नगाईन, पो० सिघाड़ी बाया गोह, जिला-गया (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कामेश्वर शर्मा को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं० /239/69(93)]

**S.O. 2153.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Jagdeo Prasad Yadav, R/O Village Dhanlana, P.O. Nadrganj, District Gaya (Bihar), a contesting candidate for the mid-term election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in February, 1969 from Hisua Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Jagdeo Prasad Yadav, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/253/69(94).]

**एस० प्रो० 2153:**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार विधान सभा के लिये फरवरी, 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिये 253-हसुआ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जगदेव प्रसाद यादव, निवासी ग्राम-धनियावा, डा० नारदीगंज,

जिला गया (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री जगदेव प्रसाद यादव को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० स०/253/69(94)]

**S.O. 2154.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Pyare Lal, R/O Village and P.O. Hisua, Tola Mahavir Asthan Road, Panchu, District Gaya (Bihar), a contesting candidate for the mid-term election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in February, 1969 from Hisua Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Pyare Lal, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/253/69(95).]

एस० ओ० 2154.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार विधान सभा के लिये 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिये 253—हसुआ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री प्यारे लाल, निवासी ग्राम एवं पो० हसुआ लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाये गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री प्यारे लाल को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० स०/253/69 (95)]

New Delhi, the 27th May 1970

**S.O. 2155.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Santu Mahtha, R/O Village Barmasia, P.O. Deoghar, District Santhal Parganas (Bihar), a contesting candidate for the mid-term election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly held in February, 1969 from Deoghar Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge

an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied, that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Santu Mahtha to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/150/69(96).]

By Order,

ROSHAN LAL, Secy..

नई दिल्ली, 27 मई, 1970

एन० ओ० 2155.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि बिहार विधान सभा के लिये फरवरी, 1969 में हुए मध्यावधि निर्वाचन के लिये देवघर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सन्तु महथा, निवासी ग्राम बरमसिया, पो० देवघर, जिला संताल परगना (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा वाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण अथवा न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री सन्तु महथा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० स०/150/69(96)]

आदेश से,

रोशन लाल, सचिव।

# MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 25th May 1970

S.O. 2156.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 15th May, 1970.

## BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .	15,64,14,000
		Rupee Coin . . . . .	14,99,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	150,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .	4,98,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted : . . . . .	—
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	155,00,00,000	(a) Internal . . . . .	..
		(b) External . . . . .	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	18,13,35,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	35,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad* . . . . .	112,05,28,000
		Investments** . . . . .	90,54,95,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	75,00,00,000	Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government . . . . .	..
		(ii) State Governments@ . . . . .	165,07,53,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
Deposits :—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .	269,87,55,000
(a) Government		(ii) State Co-operative Banks†† . . . . .	227,61,91,000
		(iii) Others . . . . .	3,36,59,000
(i) Central Government . . . . .	90,67,63,000		

LIABILITIES		ASSETS	
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund :—	
(i) State Governments . . . . .	4,78,48,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments . . . . .	33,79,85,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	15,23,18,000
(b) Banks		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	..
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures . . . . .	9,65,70,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks . . . . .	1,86,70,54,000		
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	8,72,18,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	4,64,98,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	63,53,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund :—	
(iv) Other Banks . . . . .	19,78,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	6,26,71,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	..
(c) Others . . . . .	112,02,31,000	Other Assets . . . . .	49,57,93,000
Bills Payable . . . . .	44,05,22,000		
Other Liabilities . . . . .	153,89,95,000		
	Rupees . 1021,69,62,000		Rupees . 1021,69,62,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 91,33,35,000 advanced to Scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

D ted the 20th day of May, 1970.



An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 15th day of May, 1970.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	15,64,14,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in Circulation	40,55,88,20,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued		40,71,52,34,000	(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	396,42,00,000	
			TOTAL		5,78,95,11,000
			Rupee Coin		55,06,47,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		34,37,50,76,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
TOTAL LIABILITIES		40,71,52,34,000	TOTAL ASSETS		40,71,52,34,000

Dated the 20th day of May, 1970.

B. N. ADARKAR,  
Governor.

[No. F. 3(3)-BC/70.]

## दिल्ल मंत्रालय

## (बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 मई, 1970

एस० एम० 2156.—15 मई, 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	मास्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी . . . . .	5,00,00,000	नोट . . . . .	15,64,14,000
भारक्षित निधि . . . . .	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का . . . . .	14,99,000
		छोटा सिक्का . . . . .	4,98,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .	155,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल :-	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि . . . . .	35,00,00,000	(क) देशी . . . . .	..
		(ख) विदेशी . . . . .	..
		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल . . . . .	18,13,35,000
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .	75,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया* . . . . .	112,05,28,000
जमा राशियां :-		निवेश** . . . . .	90,54,95,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और ग्रथिम :-	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार . . . . .	90,67,63,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को . . . . .	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें . . . . .	4,78,48,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को @ . . . . .	165,07,53,000
		ऋण और ग्रथिम :-	
(ख) बैंक		(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को† . . . . .	269,87,55,000
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक . . . . .	186,70,54,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को†† . . . . .	227,31,61,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	8,72,18,000	(iii) दूसरों को . . . . .	3,36,59,000

राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :-					
(क) ऋण और अग्रिम:-					
(iii) गैर-अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	.	63,53,000	(i) राज्य सरकारों को	.	33,79,85,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक	.	19,78,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	.	15,23,18,000
			(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	.	..
(ग) अन्य	.	112,02,31,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	.	9,65,70,000
			राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण		
			और अग्रिम		
देय बिल	.	44,05,22,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	†	4,64,98,000
			राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि		
			से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :-		
अन्य देयताएं	.	153,89,95,000	(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	.	6,26,71,000
			(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..	..
			अन्य आस्तियां	.	49,57,93,000
रुपये	.	1021,69,62,000	रुपये	.	1021,69,62,000

\*नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

\*\*राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किय गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मियादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 91,33,35,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

††राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

वारीड : 20 मई, 1970।

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में मई, 1970 की 15 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिये लेखा  
इसू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन:—		
नोट	15,64,14,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
संचालन में नोट	4055,88,20,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	396,42,00,000	
जारी किए गए कुल नोट		4071,52,34,000			
			नोट . . .		573,95,11,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		55,06,47,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां		3437,50,76,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र		..
कुल देयताएं] :		4071,52,34,000	कुल आस्तियां .		4071,52,34,000

तारीख : 20 मई, 1970।

बी० एन० अडारकर,  
गवर्नर।

[सं० एफ० 3 (3)-बी० सी०/70]

New Delhi, the 8th June 1970

S.O. 2157.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 29th May, 1970

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .	36,63,34,000
		Rupee Coin . . . . .	10,36,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	150,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .	5,31,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	155,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(a) Internal . . . . .	..
		(b) External . . . . .	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	7,45,82,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	35,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad* . . . . .	121,80,04,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	75,00,00,000	Investments** . . . . .	92,38,43,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government . . . . .	..
		(ii) State Governments @ . . . . .	179,63,18,000
Deposits :—		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .	276,94,15,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks†† . . . . .	226,48,12,000
(a) Government :—		(iii) Others . . . . .	5,32,59,000
(i) Central Government . . . . .	139,81,94,000		

LIABILITIES		Rs.	ASSETS		Rs.
			Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—		
(a) State Governments		4,93,11,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—		
			(i) State Governments		33,79,59,000
			(ii) State Co-operative Banks		14,82,11,000
			(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks		..
(b) Banks :—			(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank		
			Debtures		9,65,70,000
			Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund—		
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks		182,80,02,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks		4,50,81,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		8,06,12,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—		
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		62,14,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank		6,26,71,000
(iv) Other Banks		29,93,000	(b) Investment in bonds/ debentures issued by the Development Bank		..
(c) Others		104,21,70,000	Other Assets		49,74,36,000
Bills payable		47,01,53,000			
Other Liabilities		157,81,07,000			
	Rupees	1065,60,62,000		Rupees	1065,60,62,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 94,51.85,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 3rd day of June, 1970.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 for the week ended the 29th day of May, 1970

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department . . . . .	36,63,34,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation . . . . .	<u>4014,54,08,000</u>		(a) Held in India . . . . .	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued . . . . .		4051,17,42,000	(b) Held outside India . . . . .	..	
			Foreign Securities . . . . .	<u>396,42,00,000</u>	
			TOTAL . . . . .		578,95,11,000
			Rupee Coin . . . . .		54,69,92,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .		3417,52,39,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other Com- mercial paper . . . . .		..
Total Liabilities . . . . .		<u>4051,17,42,000</u>	Total Assets . . . . .		<u>4051,17,42,000</u>

Dated the 3rd day of June, 1970.

B. N. ADARKAR,  
Governor.  
[No. F. 3(3)-BC/70.]

नई दिल्ली, 8 जून, 1970

एस० नो० 2157.—29 मई 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्य-लाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी . . . . .	5,00,00,000	नोट . . . . .	36,63,34,000
भारक्षित निधि : . . . . .	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का . . . . .	10,36,000
		छोटा सिक्का . . . . .	5,31,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .	155,00,00,000	खरीदे और मुनाये गये बिल:—	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि . . . . .	35,00,00,000	(क) देशी . . . . .	..
		(ख) विदेशी . . . . .	..
		(ग) सरकार से खजाना बिल . . . . .	7,45,82,000
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .	75,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया* . . . . .	121,80,04,000
जमा राशियां :—		निवेश** . . . . .	92,38,43,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और धप्रिम :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार . . . . .	139,84,94,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को . . . . .	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें . . . . .	4,93,11,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को@ . . . . .	179,63,18,000
		ऋण और धप्रिम :—	
(ख) बैंक		(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों . . . . .	276,94,15,000
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक . . . . .	182,80,02,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को . . . . .	226,48,12,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	8,06,12,000	(iii) दूसरों को . . . . .	5,32,59,000



(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	62,14,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	29,99,000	ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(ग) अन्य	104,21,70,000	(i) राज्य सरकारों को	33,79,59,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	14,82 11,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
देय बिल	47,01,53,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	9,65,70,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
अन्य देयताएं	157,81,07,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	4,50,81,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	6,26,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		अन्य आस्तियां	49,74,36,000
रूपये 10,65,60,62,000		रूपये 10,65,60,62,000	

\*नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

\*\*राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मियादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 94,51,85,000 रु० शामिल हैं।

††राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख : 3 जून, 1970

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में मई 1970 की 29 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिये लेखा

इशू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन		
नोट . . . . .	36,63,34,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ ।	182,53,11,000	
संचलन में नोट	40,14,54,08,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा		
			हुआ . . . . .	..	
जारी किए गए कुल नोट		40,51,17,42,000	विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	396,42,00,000	
			जोड़ . . . . .		578,95,11,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		54,69,92,000
			भारत सरकार की स्वयं		
			प्रतिभूतियां		34,17,52,39,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और		
			दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र . . . . .		..
कुल देयताएं . . . . .		40,51,17,42,000	कुल आस्तियां . . . . .		40,51,17,42,000

तारीख : 3 जून, 1970

बी० एन० अडारकर,  
गवर्नर ।

[सं० एफ० 3(3)बी० सी०/70]

New Delhi, the 9th June 1970

**S.O. 2158.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the undernoted co-operative banks for a further period of one year with effect from 1st March, 1970.

1. The Tuticorin Co-operative Bank Ltd., Tuticorin.
2. The Kara-ikal Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., Karaikal.
3. The Darjeeling District Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Kalimpong.

[No. F. 18/7/70-SB.]

नयी दिल्ली, 9 जून, 1970

**एस०ओ० 2158.**—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम 1949 (1949 का वसवा) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्द्वारा यह घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्ध 1 मार्च 1970 से एक वर्ष की अतिरिक्त अवधि तक निम्नलिखित सहकारी बैंकों पर लागू नहीं होंगे :

1. तुत्तिकुडी कोओपरेटिव बैंक लिमिटेड, तुत्तिकुडी
2. करार्ककन कोओपरेटिव ग्राम्य बैंक लिमिटेड, करार्ककल
3. दार्जिलिंग डिस्ट्रिक्ट सेंट्रल कोओपरेटिव बैंक लिमिटेड, कालिम्पोंग

[संख्या एक० 18/7/70-एस० बी०]

New Delhi, the 11th June 1970

**S.O. 2159.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 45 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby directs that the Reserve Bank of India may appoint any body corporate specified in column 2 of First Schedule to the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970 (5 of 1970) as its agent at all or any of the places in India specified in the Table below, where there is a branch or office of that body corporate.

TABLE

- (a) Greater Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi, including New Delhi, Madras, Bangalore, Nagpur, Patna and Kanpur.
- (b) All other places at which there is a Government treasury or sub-treasury or the population of which according to the latest published report of the Census of India is not less than one lakh.

[No. F. 4(150)-BC/69.]

L. S. P. SARATHY, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जून, 1970

**एस०ओ० 2159.**—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा निदेश देती है कि भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक, बैंकिंग समवाय (उपक्रमों का अधिग्रहण और अन्तरण) अधिनियम, 1970 (1970 का पांचवा) की प्रथम अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में निर्दिष्ट किसी भी निगम निकाय को नीचे की गयी सारणी में निर्दिष्ट भारत में किसी भी स्थान या सभी स्थानों के लिए जहाँ उस निगम निकाय की शाखा या कार्यालय हो अपना अधिकर्ता नियुक्त कर सकता है।

## सारणी

- (क) बृहत्तर बम्बई, कलकत्ता, नई दिल्ली, मद्रास, बंगलौर, नागपुर, पटना तथा कानपुर ।  
 (ख) अन्य वे सभी स्थान जहाँ राजकोष या उप राजकोष या जहाँ कि जनसंख्या भारतीय जनगणना की मुद्रित हाल की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार एक लाख से कम न हो ।

[संख्या एफ० 4 (150)—बी० सी०/69]

एल० एस० पार्थसारथी, अनु-सचिव ।

## (Department of Revenue and Insurance)

## CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 20th June 1970

S.O. 2160.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 25 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government, being satisfied that it is necessary in the public interest so to do, hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. 1-Customs, dated the 1st January, 1970, namely:—

In the said notification, for the words "Zambia or Tanzania"; wherever they occur, including the preamble, the words "Zambia, Tanzania or Malawi" shall be substituted.

[No. 54/F. No. 90/44/70-L.C.I.]

P. K. KAPOOR, Under Secy.

## (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

## सीमाशुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 1970

क्र० आ० 2160.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 25 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना लोक हित में आवश्यक है भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं 1 सीमाशुल्क तारीख 1 जनवरी 1970 में एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "जाम्बिया या तन्जानिया" शब्दों, उद्देशिका सहित जहाँ कहीं भी वे आये हों, के स्थान पर "जामिया, तन्जानिया या मलावी" शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किए जायेंगे ।

[सं० 54/एफ० सं० 90/44/70—एफ० सी०—1]

पी० के० कपूर, अवसर सचिव ।

## (Department of Revenue and Insurance)

## CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 20th June 1970

S.O. 2161.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of section 152 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government hereby directs that the powers of confiscation of goods exercisable under clause (a) of section 122 of the said Act, by a Collector of Customs, shall also be exercisable by an

Assistant Collector of Customs in such cases involving under-valuation or over-valuation of goods where the extent of under-valuation or, as the case may be, over-valuation is less than Rs. 10,000.

[No. 55-Customs/F. No. 22/9/70-Cus.IV.]

K. J. RAMAN, Under Secy.

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

सीमा शुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 1970

एस० नो० 2161:—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 152 के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश देती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 122 के खण्ड (क) के अधीन सीमा शुल्क कलक्टर द्वारा प्रयोक्तव्य माल के अधिहरण की शक्तियां ऐसे मामलों में सहायक सीमा शुल्क कलक्टर द्वारा भी प्रयोक्तव्य होंगी जिनमें कि माल का न्यून-मूल्यांकन या अतिमूल्यांकन अन्तर्बलित है और जहां यथास्थिति न्यून-मूल्यांकन या अतिमूल्यांकन की मात्रा 10,000/- रु० से कम है।

[सं० 55-सीमा शुल्क/एफ० सं० 22/9/70-सी० शु०]

के० जे० रामन, अवसर सचिव।

राजस्व और बीमा विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 16 मई, 1970

नो० नो० 1902 —जीवन बीमा निगम अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 31) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा डा० आर० के० हजारी भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के डिप्टी गवर्नर को श्री बी० एन० अद्वारकर जिन्होंने पद त्याग दिया है के स्थान पर 31 अगस्त, 1970 तक भारत के जीवन बीमा निगम का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 1(1)/आई० एन० एस० 11/68]

आर० के० महाजन, उप सचिव।

## CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

### INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 29th May 1970

**S.O. 2162.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Additional Commissioner of Income-tax and Additional Commissioners of Income-tax (Recovery) specified in column 3 of Annexure A appended to this notification will have concurrent jurisdiction along with the Commissioners of Income-tax specified in column 2 of Annexure 'A' and will perform all or any of the functions performed by the respective Commissioners of Income-tax in respect of the jurisdiction vested in them under Board's notifications issued from time to time.

### ANNEXURE A

S. No.	Commissioners of Income-tax	Additional Commissioners of Income tax
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	CIT, Andhra Pradesh-I, Hyderabad-34	Addl. CIT, Andhra Pradesh-I, Hyderabad-34.
2	CIT, Andhra Pradesh-II, Hyderabad-34	Addl. CIT, Andhra Pradesh-II, Hyderabad-34.

(1)	(2)	(3)
3	CIT, Assam, Nagland, Manipur and Tripura, Shillong-I.	Addl. CIT, Assam, Nagaland, Manipur and Tripura, Shillong-I.
4	CIT, Bhihar, Patna . . . .	Addl. CIT, Bihar, Patna.
5	CIT, Bombay City-I, Bombay . . .	Addl. CIT, Bombay City-I, Bombay.
6	CIT, Bombay City-II, Bombay. . .	Addl. CIT, Bombay City-II, Bombay.
7	CIT, Bombay City-III, Bombay . . .	Addl. CIT, Bombay City-III, Bombay.
8	CIT, Delhi-I, New Delhi . . . .	Addl. CIT, Delhi I, New Delhi.
9	CIT, Delhi-II, New Delhi . . . .	Addl. CIT, Delhi-II, New Delhi.
10	CIT, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Delhi-III, New Delhi.	Addl. CIT, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Delhi-III, New Delhi.
11	CIT, Gujarat-I, Ahmedabad . . . .	Addl. CIT, Gujarat-I, Ahmedabad.
12	CIT, Gujarat II, Ahmedabad . . . .	Addl. CIT, Gujarat-II, Ahmedabad.
13	CIT, Gujarat III, Ahmedabad . . . .	Addl. CIT, Gujarat-III, Ahmedabad.
14	CIT, Kerala, Ernakulam (South) Cochin-I.	Addl. CIT, Kerala, Ernakulam (South) Cochin.
15	CIT, Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal at Nagpur .	Addl. CIT, Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal at Nagpur.
16	CIT, Vidarbha & Marathwada, Nagpur .	Addl. CIT, Vidarbha & Marathwada, Nagpur.
17	CIT, Madras-I, Madras-34 . . . .	Addl. CIT, Madras-I, Madras-34.
18	CIT, Madras-II, Madras-34 . . . .	Addl. CIT, Madras-II, Madras.
19	CIT, Bangalore-I . . . .	Addl. CIT, Bangalore-I.
20	CIT, Orissa, Bhubaneshwar-I . . . .	Addl. CIT, Orissa, Bhubaneshwar-I.
21	CIT, Poona . . . .	Addl. CIT, Poona.
22	CIT, Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir & Chandigarh, Patiala.	Addl. CIT, Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir & Chandigarh, Patiala.
23	CIT, Rajasthan, Jaipur . . . .	Addl. CIT, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
24	CIT, Lucknow . . . .	Addl. CIT, Lucknow.
25	CIT, Kanpur . . . .	Addl. CIT, Kanpur.
26	CIT, West Bengal-I, Calcutta-I . . .	Addl. CIT, West Bengal-I, Calcutta-I.
27	CIT, West Bengal-II, Calcutta-I . . .	Addl. CIT, West Bengal-II, Calcutta-I.
28	CIT, West Bengal-III, Calcutta-I . . .	Addl. CIT, West Bengal-III, Calcutta-I.
29	CIT, West Bengal-I, CIT, West Bengal-II, CIT, West Bengal-III, CIT, (Central), Calcutta.	Addl. CIT (Recovery), Calcutta.
30	CIT, Bombay City-I, CIT, Bombay City-II, CIT, Bombay City-III, CIT, (Central), Bombay.	Addl. CIT (Recovery), Bombay.
31	CIT, Madras-I, CIT, Madras-II, CIT, (Central), Madras.	Addl. CIT (Recovery), Madras.
32	CIT, Delhi-I, CIT, Delhi-II, CIT, Delhi-III & CIT, (Central), Delhi.	Addl. CIT (Recovery), Delhi.

## केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

### आय-कर

नई दिल्ली, 29 मई, 1970

एस० नो० 2162.-—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा निदेश देता है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न उपाबन्ध 'क' के स्तम्भ 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट अपर आय-कर आयुक्तों और अपर आय-कर आयुक्तों (बसूली) की उपाबन्ध 'क' के स्तम्भ 2 में विनिर्दिष्ट आय-कर आयुक्तों के साथ-साथ समवर्ती अधिकारिता होगी और वे समय-समय पर जारी की गई बोर्ड की अधिसूचनाओं के अन्तर्गत उनमें निहित अधिकारिता के बारे में सम्बन्धित आय-कर आयुक्तों द्वारा पालन किए जाने वाले सभी या किन्हीं कृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।

### उपाबन्ध क

क्रम सं०	आय-कर आयुक्त	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त
1	2	3
1	आय-कर आयुक्त, आन्ध्र प्रदेश—I हैदराबाद-34	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, आन्ध्र प्रदेश—I, हैदराबाद-34
2	आय-कर आयुक्त, आन्ध्र प्रदेश-II, हैदराबाद-34	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, आन्ध्र प्रदेश-II, हैदराबाद-34
3	आय-कर आयुक्त, असम, नागालैण्ड, मनीपुर और त्रिपुरा, शिलांग—1	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, असम, नागालैण्ड, मनीपुर, और त्रिपुरा, शिलांग—1
4	आय-कर आयुक्त, बिहार, पटना।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, बिहार, पटना।
5	आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई, नगर—I, मुम्बई।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई—I, मुम्बई।
6	आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई नगर-II, मुम्बई।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई नगर-II, मुम्बई।
7	आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई नगर-II, मुम्बई।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई-नगर-III मुम्बई।
8	आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली—I, नई दिल्ली।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली—I, नई दिल्ली।
9	आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-II, नई दिल्ली।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-II, नई दिल्ली।
10	आय-कर आयुक्त, हरियाणा, हिमाचल प्रदेश और दिल्ली-III, नई दिल्ली।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, हरियाणा, हिमाचल प्रदेश और दिल्ली-III, नई दिल्ली।
11	आय-कर आयुक्त, गुजरात—I, अहमदाबाद।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, गुजरात—I, अहमदाबाद।
12	आय-कर आयुक्त, गुजरात-II, अहमदाबाद।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, गुजरात-II, अहमदाबाद।

1	2	3
13 आय-कर आयुक्त, गुजरात—III, अहमदाबाद ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, गुजरात—III, अहमदाबाद ।	
14 आय-कर आयुक्त, केरल, एर्नाकुलम् (दक्षिण), कोचीन—16 ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, केरल, एर्नाकुलम् (दक्षिण) कोचीन ।	
15 आय-कर आयुक्त, मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल नागपुर में	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल नागपुर में ।	
16 आय-कर आयुक्त, विदर्भ और मराठवाड़ा, नागपुर	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, विदर्भ और मराठवाड़ा, नागपुर ।	
17 आय-कर आयुक्त, मद्रास—I, मद्रास—34 ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, मद्रास—I, मद्रास—34 ।	
18 आय-कर आयुक्त, मद्रास—II, मद्रास—34 ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, मद्रास—II, मद्रास ।	
19 आय-कर आयुक्त, बंगलूर—I	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, बंगलूर—I ।	
20 आय-कर आयुक्त, उड़ीसा, भुवनेश्वर—I	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, उड़ीसा, भुवनेश्वर—I,	
21 आय-कर आयुक्त, पूना ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, पूना ।	
22 आय-कर आयुक्त, पंजाब, जम्मू तथा काश्मीर और जण्डीगढ़, पटियाला ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, पंजाब, जम्मू तथा काश्मीर और जण्डीगढ़, पटियाला ।	
23 आय-कर आयुक्त, राजस्थान, जयपुर ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, राजस्थान, जयपुर ।	
24 आय-कर आयुक्त, लखनऊ, ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, लखनऊ ।	
25 आय-कर आयुक्त, कानपुर ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, कानपुर ।	
26 आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल कलकत्ता ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—I, कलकत्ता—1	
27 आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—II, कलकत्ता 1	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—II, कलकत्ता—1	
28 आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—III कलकत्ता—1	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—III, कलकत्ता—1	
29 आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम-बंगाल—I, आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—II, आय-कर आयुक्त, पश्चिम बंगाल—III, आय-कर आयुक्त, (केन्द्रीय) कलकत्ता	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, (वसूली), कलकत्ता	
30 आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई नगर—I, आय-कर आयुक्त, मुम्बई नगर—II, आयकर आयुक्त, मुम्बई नगर—III, आय-कर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), मुम्बई ।	अपर आय-कर आयुक्त, (वसूली), मुम्बई ।	



1

2

3

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>31 आय-कर आयुक्त, मद्रास—I,<br/>आय-कर आयुक्त, मद्रास—II,<br/>आय-कर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), मद्रास ।</p>                               | <p>अपर आय-कर आयुक्त (बसूली), मद्रास 1</p> |
| <p>32 आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली—I,<br/>आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली—II,<br/>आय-कर आयुक्त, दिल्ली—III,<br/>आय-कर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), दिल्ली ।</p> | <p>अपर आय-कर आयुक्त (बसूली), दिल्ली ।</p> |

[सं० 86 (फा० सं० 187/13/70—आई० टी० (ए० आई०)]]

**S.O. 2163.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Additional Commissioners of Income-tax and Additional Commissioners of Income-tax (Recovery), mentioned in the Boards notification No. 86 [F. No. 187/13/70(AI)] dated 29th May, 1970, will perform the functions of the Commissioners of Income-tax as per Annexure 'A' and Annexure 'B' respectively.

#### ANNEXURE A

1. Revisionary powers under sections 263 and 264.
2. Sanction for proceedings under section 147 (a) and issue of Notice under section 148 [Section 151 (2)].
3. Approval of annuity contract under Section 80E (3) and withdrawal of approval.
4. Relief when salary etc., is paid in arrears or in advance under section 89 (1).
5. Determination of period to be excluded for interest calculation—Section 243 (2) of the Act.
6. Determination of appearance by authorised representatives under section 288(4).
7. Recognition of Provident Funds under Part-A Fourth Schedule.
8. Approval of Superannuation Funds under Part B-Fourth Schedule.
9. Approval of Gratuity Funds under Part C-Fourth Schedule.
10. Corresponding powers under the Gift Tax Act and Wealth Tax Act.

#### ANNEXURE B

All the functions of the Commissioner of Income-tax, under the Income-tax Act, 1961, and the Income-tax Act, 1922, in connection with the recovery of taxes including stay of demands, withholding of refunds under section 241 and the work of Tax Recovery Commissioners.

[No. 87 (F. No. 187/13/70-IT(AI)).]

**एस०ओ० 2163.**—आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा निदेश देता है कि बोर्ड की अधिसूचना सं० 86 (फा० 187/13/70—आई० टी० (ए० आई०) तारीख 29-5-1970 में वर्णित अपर आय-कर आयुक्त और अपर आय-कर आयुक्त (बसूली) क्रमशः उपाबन्ध 'क' और उपाबन्ध, 'ख' के अनुसार आय-कर आयुक्तों के कृत्यों का पालन करेंगे ।

## उपाबन्ध क

- 1 धारा 263 और 264 के अधीन पुनरीक्षण की शक्तियाँ ।
- 2 धारा 147 (क) के अधीन कार्यवाहियों के लिये और धारा 148 के अधीन सूचना जारी करने के लिये मंजूरी [(धारा 151 (2))] ।
- 3 धारा 80 ड० (3) के अधीन वार्षिकी संविदा का अनुमोदन और अनुमोदन का प्रत्याहरण ।
- 4 धारा 89 (1) के अधीन उस दशा में राहत जिसमें वेतन आदि का संशय बकाया के रूप में या अग्रिम के रूप में किया जाता है ।
- 5 उस कालावधि का अवधारण जिसे व्याज के परिकसन के लिये अपवर्जित किया जाना है—अधिनियम की धारा 243 (2)
- 6 धारा 288 (4) के अधीन प्राधिकृत प्रतिनिधियों द्वारा हाजरी संबंधी अवधारण
- 7 चतुर्थ अनुसूची, भाग-क के अधीन भविष्य निधियों को मान्यता देना
- 8 चतुर्थ अनुसूची, भाग-ख के अधीन अधिवार्षिकी निधियों का अनुमोदन
- 9 चतुर्थ अनुसूची, भाग-ग के अधीन उपदान निधियों का अनुमोदन
- 10 दान-कर अधिनियम और धन-कर अधिनियम के अधीन तत्समान शक्तियाँ ।

## उपाबन्ध ख

करों की बसूली के संबंध में, जिसके अन्तर्गत धारा 241 के अधीन मांगों को रोकना, प्रतिदायों को रोक रखना भी आते हैं, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 और आय-कर अधिनियम 1922 के अधीन आय-कर आयुक्तों के सभी कृत्य और कर बसूली आयुक्तों का कार्य ।

[सं० 87 (फा० सं० 187/13/70-आई० टी० (ए० आई०))]

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 22nd May 1970

**S.O. 2164.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby modifies its notification No. 3(F. No. 55/165/68-IT(AI) dated 24th April, 1970 as under:—

- (1) Substitute the following against entries at S. Nos. 46 and 47 on page 4 of the Annexure:—

46. A.G.M.P., Gwallor, Income-tax officer, A-Ward, Gwallor.

47. DAG (Works) M.P., Bhopal, Income-tax Officer, A-Ward, Bhopal.

[No. 6/F. No. 55/165/68-IT(AI).]

L. N. GUPTA, Under Secy.

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली 22 मई, 1970

एस० ओ० 2164—आय कर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 126 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्षकर बोर्ड एतद्वारा 24 अप्रैल 1970 की अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 3 (फा० सं० 55/165/68 आय कर ए-1) में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है :—

(1) अनुबन्ध के पृष्ठ 4 पर दी गई प्रविष्टियां 46 तथा 47 के सामने निम्नलिखित प्रति-स्थापित किया जाय :—

- |  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 46. महालेखाकार, मध्य प्रदेश, ग्वालियर          | आयकर अधिकारी, ए-वार्ड, ग्वालियर । |
| 47. उप महालेखाकार (निर्माण) मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल | आयकर अधिकारी, ए-वार्ड, भोपाल ।    |

[सं० 6 (फा० सं० 55/165/68—आयकर (ए-1)]

एल एन० गुप्त, अवर सचिव ।

# MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Industrial Development)

New Delhi, the 11th June 1970

**S.O. 2165.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 72 of the Indian Patents and Designs Act, 1911 (2 of 1911), the Central Government hereby appoints the Honorary Secretary, Institution of Engineers (India) Sub-Centre, Teliarganj, Allahabad, as an authority for the purpose of the said section and directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.R.O. 681, dated the 23rd March, 1955, namely:—

In the said notification, after item (39) and the entry, relating thereto, the following item and entry shall be inserted, namely:—

“(40) The Honorary Secretary, Institution of Engineers (India) Sub-Centre, Teliarganj, Allahabad”.

[No. F. 33(15)-PP&D/70.]

HARGUNDAS, Under Secy.

औद्योगिक विकास, आन्तरिक और कंपनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(औद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जून, 1970

**फा० आ० 2165.**—भारतीय पेटेंट और डिजाइन अधिनियम, 1911 (1911 का 2) की धारा 72 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा अवैतनिक सचिव इंजीनियर-संस्था (भारत) उपकेन्द्र तेलियरगंज इलाहाबाद को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजन के लिए एक प्राधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और निवेश देती है कि भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय की

अधिसूचना सं० का० नि० 681, तारीख 23 मार्च, 1955 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, मद (39) और उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टि क पश्चात् निम्नलिखित मद और प्रविष्टि अन्तःस्थापित की जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

“(40) अवैतनिक सचिव,  
इंजीनियर-संस्था (भारत) उपकेन्द्र,  
तेलियर गंज,  
इलाहाबाद”

[सं० का० 33 (15) -पी० पी० एंड डी०/70]

हरगुन दास, अवर सचिव ।

(Department of Industrial Development)

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd June 1970

**S.O. 2166/DRA/5.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), read with rule 8 of the Central Advisory Council (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. M. Dahanukar to be member of the Central Advisory Council of Industries till the 4th March, 1972, in place of Dr. Pranlal J. Patel and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industrial Development, Internal Trade and Company Affairs (Department of Industrial Development) No. S.O. 971, dated the 5th March, 1970, namely:—

In the said Order, for entry No. 4 relating to Dr. Pranlal J. Patel, the following entry shall be substituted:—

“4. Shri S. M. Dahanukar, President, All India Manufacturers' Organisation, Jeevan Sahakar, Sir Phirozshah Mehta Road, Bombay-1.

[No. 1(3)/Lic. Pol/69.]

R. C. SETHI, Under Secy.

(औद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 जून, 1970

**एस० ओ०.—2166 आई० जी० आर० ए०/5—उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) अधिनियम 1951 (1961 का 65 वां) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सलाहकार परिषद (कार्यविधि नियम 1952 के नियम 8 के साथ पढ़ते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा डा० प्राण लाल जे० पटेल के स्थान पर श्री एस० एम० दहानुकर को 4 मार्च, 1972 तक उद्योगों के केन्द्रीय सलाहकार परिषद का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है तथा निदेश देती है कि औद्योगिक विकास आंतरिक व्यापार**

तथा समवाय कार्य मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक विकास विभाग) भारत सरकार के आदेश संख्या एस० ओ० 971 दिनांक 5 मार्च, 1970 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किये जायें, अर्थात् :-

उपर्युक्त आदेश में डा० प्राणलाल जे० पटेल से संबंधित प्रविष्टि संख्या 4 में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी :-

" 4 श्री एस० एस० दहानुकर, -

अध्यक्ष, आल इंडिया मैनुफैक्चर्स आर्गनाइजेशन

जीवन साहाकार,

सर फिरोजशाह मेहता रोड, बंबई 1।

[सं० 1 (3)/लाइसेंस पो०/69

आर० सी० सेठी, अवर सचिव।

# MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING AND WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Works, Housing and Urban Development)

New Delhi, the 11th June 1970

**S.O. 1167.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1958 (32 of 1958), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the table below, being officer equivalent to the rank of a gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on estate officers by or under the said Act within the local limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said table.

THE TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Labour Officer, Hindustan Shipyard Limited, Visakhapatnam.	Public premises belonging to or taken on lease by and under the administrative control of Hindustan Shipyard Limited.

[No. F. 21012(5)/67-Poll. IV]

T. K. BALASUBRAMANIAN,

Deputy Director of Estates and Ex-  
Officio Under Secy..

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन तथा निर्माण, आवास और नगर विकास मंत्रालय

(निर्माण, आवास और नगर विकास विभाग)

नयी दिल्ली, 11 जून, 1970

एस० ओ० 2167—लोक परिसर (अनधिकृत दखलकारों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1958, (1958 का 32) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार नीचे दी गयी

सारणी के खाना (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को एतद्द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के पद के समान सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है जो उक्त सारणी के खाना (2) में निर्विष्ट लोक परिसर के सम्बन्ध में अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या अधीन सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे और उन पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेंगे।

### सारणी

अधिकारी का पदनाम (1)	लोक परिसर का वर्ग और अधिकार क्षेत्र की स्थानीय सीमाएं (2)
श्रम अधिकारी, हिन्दुस्तान शिपयार्ड लिमिटेड, विशाखापटनम	हिन्दुस्तान शिपयार्ड लिमिटेड के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण क अधीन उनके स्वामित्व में या पहे पर लिये गये लोग परिसर।

[सं० फा० 21012(5)/67-नीति-4]

टी० के० बालमुन्नमणियन

उप सम्पदा निदेशक तथा पदेन अवसर सचिव।

## MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 9th June 1970

S.O. 2168.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 4 of the National Shipping Board Rules, 1960, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Godey Murahari and Shri Anant Prasad Sharma, Members of Parliament, as members of the National Shipping Board in place of Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy and Shri Y. Adinarayana Reddy and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S.O. 3767, dated the 8th September, 1969, namely:—

In the said notification for the entries against Serial Nos. 5 and 6 the entries "Shri Godey Murahari" and "Shri Anant Prasad Sharma" shall respectively be substituted.

[No. F. 37-MD(6)/69.]

JASWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

जहाजरानी और परिवहन मन्त्रालय

(परिवहन स्कन्ध)

नई दिल्ली 9 जून 1970

का० आ० 2168—राष्ट्रीय पोत-परिवहन बोर्ड नियम, 1960 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (2) के साथ पठित वाणिज्य पोत-परिवहन अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त

शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री मुल्क गोविन्द रेड्डी और श्री वाई० ब्रह्मनायक रेड्डी के स्थान पर श्री गोड़े मुराहिर और श्री अनन्तप्रसाद शर्मा, संसद् सदस्यों को राष्ट्रीय पोत-परिवहन बोर्ड के सदस्यों के रूप में एतद्वारा नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के जहाजरानी और परिवहन मन्त्रालय (परिवहन स्कन्द) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 3767 तारीख 8 सितम्बर, 1969 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्रम सं० 5 और 6 के सामने की प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर क्रमशः श्री गोड़े मुराहिर और श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा प्रविष्टियां प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी।

[सं० फा० 37-एम० डी० (6)/69]

जसवंत सिंह, अवर सचिव।

## MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES

(National Scholarships Division—N. S. 4 Section)

New Delhi, the 3rd June 1970

In the matter of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890.

AND

In the matter of the National Foundation for Teachers Welfare, New Delhi.

S.O. 2169.—In pursuance of paragraph 3 of Schedule "B" to the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Education No. S.O. 1955, dated the 25th June, 1962, as amended by the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Education No. S.O. 1485 dated the 29th April, 1967, as amended from time to time, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Education, No. S.O. 4362 dated the 17th October, 1969, the following appointments of the Chairman and members of the General Committee of the National Foundation for Teacher's Welfare, are hereby notified:—

*Chairman*

1. Prof. V.K.R.V. Rao, Minister of Education and Youth Services, Government of India (*ex-officio*).

*Vice-Chairman*

2. Shri S. Chakravarty, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Education and Youth Services (*ex-officio*).

*Members*

3. Shri Maru Singh Malik, Education Minister, Government of Haryana, Chandigarh.
4. Shri Ram Lal, Education Minister, Himachal Pradesh Administration, Simla.
5. Miss S. Panandikar, 8, Garden Homes, 712, 1st Road, Khar, Bombay.
6. Dr. D. S. Kothari, Chairman, University Grants Commission, New Delhi.
7. Chri Yash Paul Ghai, Lecturer, Government Higher Secondary School, Jandiall, Distt., Ludhiana, Punjab.
8. Shri D. C. Kothari, Chairman, Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry Kothari Building, 20, Nangambakkam High Road, Madras-34.
9. Dr. (Mrs.). Kapila Vatsyayan, Deputy Educational Adviser, Ministry of Education and Youth Services, Government of India.

*Secretary Treasurer*

10. Shri T. R. Jayaraman, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Education and Youth Services, Government of India.

[No. F. 8/6/69-NS4.]

T. R. JAYARAMAN, Jt. Secy.

## शिक्षा तथा युवक सेवा मंत्रालय

## (राष्ट्रीय छात्रवृत्ति प्रभाग)

एन० एस० 4 अनुभाग

नई दिल्ली, 3 जून, 1970

पूर्व धर्मस्व अधिनियम 1890 के मामले में

तथा

राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक कल्याण प्रतिष्ठान, नई दिल्ली के मामले में ।

एस० ओ० 2169.—भारत सरकार शिक्षा मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या एस० ओ० 1955 दिनांक 25 जून, 1962 की अनुसूची 'ख' की तीसरे पैराग्राफ का अनुसरण करते हुए, जिसे भारत सरकार शिक्षा मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० एस० ओ० 1845 दिनांक 29 अप्रैल, 1967 द्वारा संशोधित किया गया है तथा इसके समय-समय पर संशोधनों का और भारत सरकार शिक्षा मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० एस० ओ० 4362 दिनांक 17 अक्टूबर, 1969 के अधिक्रमण में राष्ट्रीय अध्यापक कल्याण प्रतिष्ठान के अध्यक्ष और सदस्यों की निम्नलिखित नियुक्तियाँ एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित की जाती हैं ।

## अध्यक्ष

1. प्रो० वी० के० आर० वी० राव,  
शिक्षा तथा युवक सेवा मन्त्री, भारत सरकार (पदेन)

## उप-अध्यक्ष

2. श्री एस० चक्रवर्ती,  
सचिव, भारत सरकार,  
शिक्षा तथा युवक सेवा मन्त्रालय (पदेन)

## सदस्य

3. श्री मारु सिंह मलिक,  
शिक्षा मन्त्री, हरियाणा शासन, चण्डीगढ़ ।
4. श्रीराम लाल,  
शिक्षा मन्त्री,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रशासन, शिमला ।
5. कुमारी एस० पानन्दीकर,  
8, गार्डन होमस,  
712 फर्स्ट रोड, खार, बम्बई ।

6. डा० डी० एस० कोठारी,

## अध्यक्ष

विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग, नई दिल्ली ।

7. श्री यशपाल चर्ह,  
लेक्चरर, राजकीय उच्चतर माध्यमिक विद्यालय, जन्दिवाली, जिला : लुधियाना पंजाब ।



8. श्री डी० सी० कोठारी,

अध्यक्ष

भारतीय वाणिज्य उद्योग चैम्बरों का प्रतिष्ठान, कोठारी भवन,  
20 नागाम्बककम हाई रोड, मद्रास—34

9. डा० (श्रीमती) कपिला वत्सयायन,

उप शिक्षा सलाहका, शिक्षा तथा युवक सेवा मन्त्रालय, भारत सरकार

सचिव—एजेंटों

10. श्री त० रा० जयरामन,

संयुक्त सचिव, शिक्षा तथा युवक सेवा मन्त्रालय, भारत सरकार ।

[सं० एफ० 8/6/69—एन० एस० 4]

त० रा० जयरामन, संयुक्त सचिव ।

## MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th June 1970

**S.O. 2170.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-rule (2) of Rule 133 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956 and in consideration of urgency of job and difficulty in procuring suitable 3.3 KV motor and control gear of 630 KW rating for working the hoist, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of Rule 118 shall be relaxed to enable M/s. Hindustan Copper Limited to use the 630 KW, 6.6 KV. motor and control gear for working a hoist underground, at their Kollhan mine subject to the condition that the relevant provisions of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956, shall be duly complied with in carrying out the installation.

[No. EL. II. 6(5)/69.]

M. RAMANATHAN, Deputy Director (Power).

सिर्वाई तथा बिजली मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 6 जून, 1970

एस० ओ० 2170:— भारतीय बिजली नियम, 1956 के नियम 133 के उपनियम (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुये और हविस के चलाने की आवश्यकता और उसके लिये 630 किलोवाट, 33 के० बी० की उपयुक्त मोटर और नियंत्रण गियर की प्राप्ति में कठिनाई को ध्यान में रखते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश करती है कि नियम 118 के उपबन्धों का शिथिलीकरण किया जाए ताकि मैसर्स हिन्दुस्तान कापर लि० अपनी कोलिहान खान में भूमिगत हविस के चलाने के लिये 630 किलोवाट, 6.6 के० बी० की मोटर और नियंत्रण गियर का प्रयोग कर सकें परन्तु शर्त यह होगी कि प्रतिष्ठापन कार्य करते समय भारतीय बिजली नियम, 1956 के सम्बन्धित उपबन्धों की पूरी पूरी परिपालना की जाएगी ।

[सं० बि० दो०-6(5)/65]

एम० रामनाथन्, उप-निदेशक (बिजली) ।

## MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 4th June 1970

**S.O. 2171.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints following persons as a member of the Advisory Panel of Central Board of Film Censors, Madras with effect from 4th June, 1970 to 30th September, 1970.

1. Smt. Padmini Achutha Menon.
2. Smt. N. S. Mani.

[No. 11/10/69-FC.]

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 4 जून, 1970

**एस० नं० 2171 :—** चल चित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5 (1) और चल चित्र (सेंसर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उपनियम 2 के साथ पठितनियम 8 के उपनियम (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 4 जून, 1970 से 30 सितम्बर, 1970 तक केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के मद्रास सलाहकार मण्डल का सदस्य नियुक्त किया है :—

1. श्रीमती पद्मिनी अच्युता मेनन
2. श्रीमती एन० एस० मणि ।

[सं० फा० 11/10/69-एफ० सी०]

**S.O. 2172.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints following persons after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors as members of Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with effect from 4th June, 1970 to 30th September, 1970.

1. Shri M. Govindan.
2. Smt. C. L. Meenakshi Amma.
3. Shri P. V. Chalapatheeswara Rao.
4. Prof. M. Mariappa Bhat.

[No. 11/10/69-FC.]

**एस० नं० 2172 :—** चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5 (1) और चलचित्र (सेंसर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उपनियम 2 के साथ पठित नियम 8 के उपनियम (3), द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार के केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड से परामर्श करके एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 4 जून, 1970 से 30 सितम्बर, 1970 तक उक्त बोर्ड के मद्रास सलाहकार मण्डल का सदस्य नियुक्त किया है :—

1. श्री एम० गोविन्दन
2. श्रीमती सी० एल० मीनाक्षी अम्मा
3. श्री पी० वी० चलापतीश्वर राव
4. प्रो० एम० मरिअप्पा भट

[फा० सं० 11/10/69-एफ० सी०]

New Delhi, the 5th June 1970

**S.O. 2173.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule (2) of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints the following persons after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Bombay with effect from 5th June, 1970 to 30th September, 1970.

1. Shri Kamalleshwar.
2. Smt. Dinbai K. Dubash.
3. Prof. (Smt.) Vijaya Rajadhyaksha.
4. Shri C. D. Jeffereis.
5. Prof. K. G. Aggarwal.
6. Prof. P. C. Dubey.
7. Shri S. S. Rege.
8. Shri D. G. Nadkarni.

[No. 11/12/69-FC.]

नई दिल्ली, 5 जून, 1970

एस० ओ० 2173.—चलचित्र अधिनियम 1952 की धारा 5(1) और चलचित्र (सेंसर) नियमावली 1958 के नियम 9 के उपनियम 2 के साथ पठित नियम 8 के उपनियम (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड से परामर्श करके एतद्द्वारा नीचे दिये गये व्यक्तियों को 5 जून 1970 से 30 सितम्बर 1970 तक उक्त बोर्ड के बम्बई सलाहकार मण्डल का सदस्य नियुक्त किया है :—

- |                                    |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. श्री कमलेश्वर                   | 5. प्रो० के० जी० अग्रवाल |
| 2. श्रीमती दिनबाई के० दुबाश        | 6. प्रो० पी० सी० दुबे    |
| 3. प्रो० (श्रीमती) विजय राजाध्यक्ष | 7. श्री एस० एस० रेगे     |
| 4. श्री सो० डी० जैफरीज             | 8. श्री डी० जी० नाडकर्णी |

[सं० फा० 11/12/69-एफ० सी०]

#### ORDER

New Delhi the 8th June, 1970

**S.O. 2174.**—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay here by approves the film specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in all its language versions to be of the description specified against it in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

#### THE FIRST SCHEDULE

(1) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 of the Andhra Pradesh Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1955 (President's A ct 4 of 1955).

#### THE SECOND SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Sr.sailam	511.46M	Shri B.R. Sathyan, R.S. Moviee, Secunderabad.		Documentary film (For release in Andhra Pradesh Circuit only)

## आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 8 जून, 1970

एस० एन० 2174.— इसके साथ लगी प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किये गये निर्देशों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा, इसके साथ लगी द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्म को उसके भारतीय भाषाओं के सभी रूपान्तरों सहित, जिसका विवरण उसके सामने उक्त द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है :—

## प्रथम अनुसूची

- (1) आन्ध्र प्रदेश सिनेमा (विनियम) अधिनियम 1955 (राष्ट्रपति के 1955 की चौथी अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (3)।

## द्वितीय अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई 35 मी० मी०	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा सम्बन्धी फिल्म है या समाचार और समयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमेन्टरी फिल्म है।
1. श्री सेलम	511.46 मीटर	श्री बी० आर० सध्यन, आर० एस० मूवी, सिकन्दरबाद			डाकुमेन्टरी फिल्म (केवल आंध्र प्रदेश सर्किट के लिए)।

[सं० फा० 28/1/70—एफ० पी० परिशिष्ट 1467]

**S.O. 2174.**—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the First schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the film specified in column of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in Gujarati to be of the description specified against it in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

## THE FIRST SCHEDULE

- (1) Sub-Section 4 of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
- (2) Sub-section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XVII of 1953).
- (3) Sub-Section (4) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Saurashtra Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Saurashtra Act XVII of 1953).

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

S. No. of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5
1. Mahat, chitra No. 124	243.84M	Director of Information Government of Gujarat, Ahmedabad.	Film dealing with news and current events (For release in Gujarat Circuit only).	

[No. F. 28/1/70-FP App. 1468]

K. K. KHAN, Under Secy.

ए० प्र० 2175 :— इसके साथ लगी प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किये गये निर्देशों के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा, इसके साथ लगी द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्म की उसके गुजराती भाषा रूपान्तर सहित, जिसका विवरण उसके सामने उक्त द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है :—

प्रथम अनुसूची

- (1) चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37वां केन्द्रीय अधिनियम) की धारा 12 की उपधारा (4) तथा धारा 16।
- (2) बम्बई सिनेमा (विनियम) अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 17वां बम्बई अधिनियम) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (3) तथा धारा 9।
- (3) सौराष्ट्र सिनेमा (विनियम) अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 17वां सौराष्ट्र अधिनियम) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (4) तथा धारा 9।

द्वितीय अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई 35 मि०मी०	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा सम्बन्धी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमेन्टरी फिल्म है।
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	महतिचित्रा संख्या 124	243.84 मीटर	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, अहमदाबाद		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं से सम्बन्धित फिल्म (केवल गुजरात सर्किट के लिये)।

[सं० फा० 28/1/70-एफ० पी० परिशिष्ट 1468]

के० के० खान, अधीक्षक सचिव।

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P. &amp; T. Board)

New Delhi, the 11th June 1970

S.O. 2176.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627, dated 8th March, 1960, the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16th July 1970, as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in DEOGARH Telephone Exchange, Bihar Circle.

[No. 5-54/70-PHB.]

D. R. BAHL,

Assistant Director General (PHB).

## संचार विभाग

(डाक तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 1970

ए० प्रो० 2176.—स्थायी आदेश क्रमसंख्या 627 दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए 1951 के भारतीय तार नियमों के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक तार महानिदेशक ने दैवगढ़ टेलीफोन केन्द्र में 16.7.70 से प्रमाणित दर-प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं० 5-54/70-पी० एच० बी०]

डी० आर० बहल,

सहायक महानिदेशक (पी० एच० बी०)

## पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन और खान तथा वातु संश्लेष्य

(पेट्रोलियम और रसायन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1969

फा० प्रो० 4923.—संश्लिष्ट रबर (कीमत नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1969 [के खण्ड 4 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा संश्लिष्ट रबर की विक्रय कीमत जो तुरंत प्रभावी होगी, निम्नलिखित रूप में नियत करती है :—

संश्लिष्ट रबर	एक्स वर्क्स]
ग्रेड एस—1500 और एस—1502	4.40 रु० प्रति कि० ग्राम
प्रायल एक्सटेंड संश्लिष्ट रबर	
ग्रेड एस—1712	3.90 रु० प्रति कि० ग्राम
संश्लिष्ट रबर ग्रेड एस—1948	6.80 रु० प्रति कि० ग्राम

(उपरोक्त कीमतों में विक्रय कमीशन सम्मिलित है)

[सं० फा० 5(7)/69-रसायन-1]

फा० फा० 4924.—संश्लिष्ट रबर (कीमत नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1969 तारीख 16 दिसम्बर, 1969 के खण्ड 2(क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री ए० सत्यन रायण उपसचिव, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन और खान तथा धातु मंत्रालय नई दिल्ली को एतद्वारा तुरन्त प्रभावी होने वाले रूप में, संश्लिष्ट रबर का नियंत्रक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० फा० 5(7)/69-रसायन-1]

### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर 1969

फा० फा० 4922.—आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 10) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और संश्लिष्ट रबर के उपभोक्ताओं को युक्तियुक्त कीमत पर देश में उत्पादित संश्लिष्ट रबर के विक्रय को विनियमित करने की दृष्टि से केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित आदेश बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम, विस्तार और प्रारंभ :—(1) यह आदेश संश्लिष्ट रबर (कीमत नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1969 कहा जा सकेगा।

(2) इसका विस्तार सम्पूर्ण भारत पर है।

(3) यह तुरन्त प्रवृत्त हो जाएगा।

2. परिभाषाएं :—इस आदेश में जब तक कि संदर्भ से अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो,

(क) “नियंत्रक” से इस आदेश के प्रयोजन के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त कोई व्यक्ति जो संश्लिष्ट रबर का नियंत्रक है, अभिप्रेत है;

(ख) “व्यवहारी” से कोई व्यक्ति, जो संश्लिष्ट रबर के क्रय या विक्रय का कारबार करता है चाहे इसका अन्य कारबार से सम्बन्ध है या नहीं, और इस में विनिर्माता भी सम्मिलित है, अभिप्रेत है;

(ग) “विनिर्माता” से कोई व्यक्ति जो संश्लिष्ट रबर का विनिर्माण करता है, अभिप्रेत है;

(घ) “विक्रय कीमत” से विनिर्माण पर पैकिंग सहित शुद्ध विक्रय कीमत जिसमें विक्रय कमीशन भी सम्मिलित है, अभिप्रेत है;

(ङ) “संश्लिष्ट रबर” से नीचे उल्लिखित और भारत में विनिर्मित किसी भी प्रकार की स्टाइरीन ब्यूटेड्योन् रबर अभिप्रेत है, अर्थात् :—

(1) संश्लिष्ट रबर ग्रेड एस-1500 और एस-1502

(2) आयल एक्सटेंडेड संश्लिष्ट रबर ग्रेड एस-1712

(3) संश्लिष्ट रबर ग्रेड एस-1958

3. विक्रय कीमत का नियंत्रण :—कोई विनिर्माता या व्यवहारी या अन्य व्यक्ति संश्लिष्ट रबर को, खण्ड 4 के अनुसरण में नियत की गई विक्रय कीमत से अधिक विक्रय कीमत पर न विक्रय करेगा और न विक्रय करने के लिए सहमत होगा या अन्यथा व्यधन करेगा।

4. विक्रय कीमत का निर्धारण :—केन्द्रीय सरकार या नियंत्रक, भारत में विनिर्मित संश्लिष्ट कृत्रिम रबर के उत्पादन की प्राक्कलित लागत को ध्यान में रखते हुए, इस प्रकार विनिर्मित संश्लिष्ट

रबर की विक्रय-कीमत को शासकीय राज-पत्र में अधिसूचना द्वारा समय-समय पर नियत कर सकेगा और संश्लिष्ट रबर की विभिन्न ग्रेडों की बाबत विभिन्न विक्रय कीमतें नियत की जा सकेंगी ।

5. **परीवार के स्थान पर कीमत सूची प्रदर्शित की जाएगी** :—हर व्यवहारी परिसर के जहाँ वह संश्लिष्ट रबर का कारबार करता है किसी सहजदृश्य भाग पर विक्रय के लिए रखे गए संश्लिष्ट रबर की विभिन्न ग्रेडों की विक्रय कीमत की सूची, ऐसी रीति से प्रदर्शित करेगा कि परिसर पर आने वाले प्रत्येक ग्राहक को देखे जाने के लिए यह सहज पहुँच में हो ।

6. **विनिर्माता और व्यवहारी विवाद को नहीं रोकेंगे** :—कोई विनिर्माता या व्यवहारी सामान्यतः विक्रय के लिए रखी गई संश्लिष्ट रबर को विक्रय से नहीं रोकेंगे ।

7. **निवेश देने, जानकारी संरक्षित आदि की शक्तियाँ** :—नियंत्रक या केन्द्रीय सरकार या राज्य सरकार का ऐसा अधिकारी जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत किया जाए आदेश द्वारा,

- (क) किसी व्यक्ति को जो भारत में संश्लिष्ट रबर का विनिर्माण करता हो या किसी व्यवहारी को यथास्थिति संश्लिष्ट रबर के विनिर्माण या क्रय, विक्रय या अन्य संव्यवहार से संबंधित अभिलेख रखने के लिए ऐसे आदेश दे सकेगा जैसा कि नियंत्रक या इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत अधिकारी आदेश में विनिर्दिष्ट करे ;
- (ख) विनिर्माता या व्यवहारी यथास्थिति जिस रीति में संश्लिष्ट रबर के किसी विनिर्माण क्रय, विक्रय या अन्य संव्यवहार का लेखा रखेगा या विनिर्दिष्ट कर सकेगा ;
- (ग) किसी विनिर्माता या किसी व्यवहारी से ऐसी बालावधि के भीतर या ऐसे अंतराल पर यथास्थिति संश्लिष्ट रबर के विनिर्माण या क्रय या विक्रय या अन्य संव्यवहार से सम्बन्धित ऐसी जानकारी विवरीणयों या रिपोर्टों ऐसे प्रारूपों में जैसे आदेश में विनिर्दिष्ट किए जाएं, देने की अपेक्षा करेगा ।

8. **निरीक्षण, प्रवेश और तलाशी की शक्तियाँ** :—नियंत्रक या केन्द्रीय सरकार या राज्य सरकार का ऐसा अधिकारी जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत किया जाए,

- (क) निरीक्षण कर सकेगा या किसी व्यक्ति को
  - (1) भारत में संश्लिष्ट रबर के विनिर्माता की या उसके नियंत्रक के अधीन संश्लिष्ट रबर के विनिर्माण से संबंधित किन्हीं बहियों, लेखों या अभिलेखों को
  - (2) किसी व्यवहारी की या उसके नियंत्रण के अधीन संश्लिष्ट रबर के क्रय विक्रय या अन्य संव्यवहार से संबंधित किन्हीं बहियों, लेखों या अभिलेखों को, या
  - (3) ऐसे विनिर्माता या व्यवहारी के या उनके नियंत्रण के अधीन संश्लिष्ट रबर के किसी स्टॉक फा ;
 निरीक्षण करने के लिए प्राधिकृत कर सकेगा ।
- (ख) किसी परिसर जहाँ संश्लिष्ट रबर यदि विनिर्मित होता हो या विक्रय होता हो या जहाँ नियंत्रक या प्राधिकृत अधिकारी के विश्वास करने का कारण हो कि संश्लिष्ट रबर की बाबत इस आदेश का उल्लंघन हुआ है, हो रहा है या होने को है, प्रवेश कर सकेगा या तलाशी ले सकेगा या किसी व्यक्ति को प्रवेश करने या तलाशी लेने के लिए प्राधिकृत कर सकेगा ।



9. **आदेशों का अनुपालन**—हर विनिर्माता या व्यवहारी या कोई अन्य व्यक्ति, जिसको इस आदेश द्वारा या इसके अधीन प्रदत्त किन्हीं शक्तियों के अधीन कोई आदेश या निदेश जारी किया गया है, ऐसे आदेश या निदेश का अनुपालन करेगा।

10. **अपील**—इस आदेश के अधीन जारी किए गए, नियंत्रक या प्राधिकृत अधिकारी के किसी आदेश या निदेश द्वारा व्यधित कोई व्यक्ति, ऐसे आदेश या निदेश की प्रति प्राप्त करने के तीस दिन के भीतर केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपील कर सकेगा।

[सं० फा० 5(7)/69-रसायन-1]

एम० रामकृष्णैया, संयुक्त सचिव।

### (पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी 1970

फा० आ० 870.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवागम सी टी एफ से कैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है :

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्ज (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरौदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शैड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सैन्ट्रल वर्कशाप के पास बरौदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी बिधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

नवागम सी टी एफ से कैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक गैस लाइन्ज का बिछाना

लाइन की चौड़ाई : 15 मीटरज

तालुका—शहर

राज्य—गुजरात

जिला—अहमदाबाद

गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
बेहरामपुर	330	0	3	0
	239	0	14	40

गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
बेहरामपुर—(शेष)	237/पी रोड 237	0	2	70
	1	0	2	52
	238/2	0	15	30
	226	0	7	92
	227	0	9	53
	225	0	6	32
	228			
	1	0	2	13
	138	1	46	04
	149	0	9	00

[सं० 29(7)/68—आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

क्र० आ० 871.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में तेल क्षेत्र नवागम सी टी एफ से कैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जाणी चाहिये और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपायबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है :

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्ज (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शैड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सैन्ट्रल वर्कशॉप के पास बरोदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि-व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

नवागम सी टी एफ से कैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक गैस पाइप लाइन बिछाना

लाइन की चौड़ाई 15 मीटर

राज्य—गुजरात

जिला—अहमदाबाद

तालुका—दशकरोई

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
श्रीद	292	0	12	45
	290	0	9	60

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हैक्टर	आर	पो आर
झौद-(शेष)	291	0	15	00
	295	0	11	40
रोड	0	2	70	
344	0	3	00	
342	0	3	00	
341	0	2	90	
337	0	0	09	
343	0	2	50	
340	0	6	90	
361/पी	0	15	03	
361/पी	0	2	67	
458	0	9	75	
461	0	3	90	
462	0	5	55	
463	0	6	45	
552	0	0	21	
559	0	7	95	
554	0	4	80	
557	0	3	75	
555	0	3	80	
556	0	5	40	
565	0	1	95	
564	0	18	15	
697	0	0	10	
696	0	12	75	
695	0	10	50	
695	0	0	50	
रोड	0	3	60	
44/पी	0	16	05	
44/पी	0	18	45	
48/पी	0	8	55	
48/पी	0	10	65	
47	0	1	92	
60/पी	0	13	95	
60/पी	0	12	60	
60/पी	0	3	05	
59	0	7	45	
58	0	16	75	

गांव का नाम	उर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
औद-(शेष)	55	0	2	15
	57	0	2	55
	रोड	0	1	85
	670	0	7	95

[सं० 29(7)/68-आई ओ सी/लिबर एण्ड लेजिस (ए).]

फा० आ० 872.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रनीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में तेज क्षेत्र नवांगाम सी टी एक से कैलीको मिल्स से (अहमदाबाद) तक पैट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसी लाइनों के बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है :

अतः, अब, पैट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) को धारा 3 को उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है ।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शीड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, मैट्रूल वर्कशाप के पास बरोदा-4 का इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा । ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसको मुनवाई प्रक्रियण हो या किमी बिधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

### अनुसूची

नवांगाम सी टी एक से कैलीको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाना

लाइन की चौड़ाई : 5 मीटर

राज्य	गुजरात	जिला	अहमदाबाद	तालुका	दशकरोड़
गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर	
बरेजा	642	0	3	45	
	कार्ट टैक	0	0	25	
	641	0	2	60	
	640	0	4	75	
	637	0	5	85	
	638	0	0	75	
	623	0	2	75	
	622	0	3	65	

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	भार	पी भार
शरेजा—(शेष)	621	0	4	15
	619	0	0	85
	620	0	0	85
	616/भाग	0	2	40
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	0	35
	616/भाग	0	2	80
	615	0	2	90
	614	0	2	25
	590	0	4	65
	588/भाग	0	5	30
	588/भाग	0	0	35
	454	0	7	80
	455	0	1	05
	456	0	4	90
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	0	85
	435	0	0	75
	434	0	7	25
	433/भाग	0	2	90
	433/भाग	0	2	55
	431	0	3	85
	430	0	2	25
	389	0	0	95
	429	0	5	10
	390	0	2	72
	391	0	0	68
	392	0	4	10
	339	0	4	45
	335	0	4	15
	341	0	4	05
	334	0	1	85
	332	0	4	15
	312	0	3	10
	202/भाग	0	6	65
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	1	30
	202/ट्रैक	0	2	55
	84	0	0	60
	83	0	6	40

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
बरेजा—(शेष)	68	0	2	75
	81	0	2	70
	80	0	4	10
	79	0	3	55
	77	0	3	80
	95	0	0	75
	96	0	5	80
	97	0	3	65
	98	0	3	25
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	0	30
	2668	0	5	40
	2657	0	2	50
	2658	0	5	20
	2653	0	0	45
	2659	0	1	95
	2651	0	3	15
	2650	0	2	85
	2634	0	4	00
	2633	0	1	00
	2635	0	4	25
	2630	0	5	50
	2628	0	1	00
रोड (कार्ट ट्रैक)		0	1	80
	2599	0	2	50
	2597	0	3	00
	2595	0	0	25
	2594	0	6	00
	2593	0	5	00
	2592	0	4	75

[सं० 29(7)/68—आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस(बी).]

का० आ० 873.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में तेल क्षेत्र नवांगाम सी टी एक से कैलीको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपायबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है :

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते

हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है ।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्ज (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शैड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सैन्ट्रल वर्कशॉप के पास बरोदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा । ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

### अनुसूची

नवागाम सी टी एक से कैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाना  
पाइपलाइन की चौड़ाई, 5 मीटर

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—अहमदाबाद	तालुका—दशकरोई		
गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या ब्लाक	हैक्टर	अर	पी अर
गिरामथ	9	0	8	75
	8	0	5	75
	10	0	3	50
	37/भाग	0	0	80
	37/भाग	0	1	35
	37/भाग	0	1	25
	36	0	2	05
	38	0	3	30
	52	0	2	05
	53	0	1	75
	55	0	1	85
	67	0	4	10
	64	0	3	30
	65	0	1	00
	63	0	2	85
	कार्टे ट्रैक	0	0	75
	78	0	1	80
	79	0	1	00
	96	0	8	10
	80	0	0	15
	95/पार्टे	0	1	45
	95/पार्टे	0	0	60
	95/पार्टे	0	2	40

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या ब्लॉक	हैक्टर	आर	पी आर
गिरामथ (शेष)	95/पार्ट	0	1	10
	95/पार्ट	0	0	85
गिरामथ (गोण्टी)	171	0	0	75
	170	0	2	90
	181	0	3	45
	182	0	3	45
	184/भाग	0	0	50
	184/भाग	0	0	50
	184/भाग	0	0	95
	184/भाग	0	2	90
	190	0	3	00
	187	0	8	00
	93	0	4	00
	92	0	1	80
	169	0	3	55

[सं० 29(7)/68—आई ओ सी/लिबर एण्ड लेजिस (सी)]

का० आ० 874.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवागाम सी टी एफ से कैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक रैट्रोपलाइन के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, रैट्रोपलाइन पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्ज (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरौदा के पश्चिमी क्षत्र, शेड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सैन्ट्रल वर्कशॉप के पास बरौदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत: हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।



## अनुसूची

नवांगाम सी टी एफ से हैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाना  
लाइन की चौड़ाई : 15 मीटर

राज्य—गुजरात

जिला—अहमदाबाद

तालुका—दशरूरी

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या ब्लाक	हैक्टर	आर	पी आर
कमोद	“28/पी	0	85	70
	रोड	0	1	50
	28/पी	0	72	60
	57	0	49	50
	115	0	66	00
	106	0	22	75
	109	0	72	00
	102	0	00	30
	107	0	16	05
	108	0	04	80
	कार्ट ट्रैक सिमदनी	0	00	45

[सं० 29(7)/68—आई ओ सी/लिबर एण्ड लेजिस (डी)]

बि०आ० 875.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में तेल क्षेत्र नवांगाम सी टी एफ से हैलिको मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक पैट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब, पैट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्ज (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरौदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शेड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सैन्ट्रल वर्कशाप के पास बरौदा —4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

नवागाम सी टी एफ से कैलिफो मिल्स (अहमदाबाद) तक पाइपल इन बिछाना  
लाइन की चौड़ाई : 5 मीटर

राज्य—गुजरात

जिला—अहमदाबाद

तालुका—दशकरोई

गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हैक्टर	आर	पी आर
वासई	686	0	4	65
	687/भाग	0	1	15
	687/भाग	0	1	30
	687/भाग	0	1	55
	687/भाग	0	1	85
	687/भाग	0	1	60
	687/भाग	0	0	75
	687/भाग	0	3	70

[संख्या 29(7)/68-आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस (ई)]

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च 1970

का० आ० 974.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि भारतीय तेल निगम लि० के राजबन्ध डिलिवरी पाइन्ट से भारतीय उर्वरक निगम के दुर्गापुर यूनिट (पश्चिमी बंगाल राज्य) के अहाते तक पेट्रोलियम पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन भारतीय तेल निगम लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है ।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, भारतीय तेल निगम लि० के कार्यालय, 9 सईयद अमीर अली एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-17 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा । ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

## अनुसूची

पी एस कन्कमा                      नेफथा लाइन                      जिला बर्दवान (पश्चिम बंगाल)

मौजे का नाम	प्लॉट नम्बर	विस्तृत क्षेत्र	भूमि का व्योरा
खाट पुकर जे एल 59	1310	. 005	दक्षिण-पूर्व
	1312	. 11	उत्तर
	1324	. 005	-वही-
	1325	. 01	-वही-
	1326	. 018	-वही-
	1327	. 01	दक्षिण-पूर्व
	1330	. 03	दक्षिण
	1331	. 12	मध्य
	1332	. 01	दक्षिण
	1333	. 03	मध्य

[मं० 28 (7)/68-आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

नई दिल्ली, 9 मार्च 1970

ब० आ० 1060.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में तेल क्षेत्र में व्यघन स्थल कुआं संख्या एस० बी० बी० से सोभासन-1 कूप मुख प्रति स्थापन तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ;

2. अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है ।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्स (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरौवा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शॉड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सैन्ट्रल बर्कशाप के पास, बरौडा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा । ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

## अनुसूची

व्यघन स्थल संख्या एस एस बी से सोभासन तक पाइप लाइन बिछाना

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—महेसाना	तालुका—महेसाना			
गांव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	अरर	पी	अरर
हैबवा	180	0	14		84
	165	0	12		38
	164	0	5		62
	168	0	9		00
	बी पी रोड	0	00		44
	221	0	2		50
	222	0	12		50
	223	0	00		25

[सं० 11(1)/70-लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

प्रा० अ० 1131.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवांगाम तेल क्षेत्र में व्यघन स्थल कुंआ संख्या जी जी एस से जी जी एस 2 ( एक ) तक पैट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ;

2. अतः, अब, पैट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद् द्वारा घोषित किया है ।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्स (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, रोड नं० 27, मकगपुरा रोड, सेंट्रल वर्कशॉप के पास, बरोदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

## अनुसूची

नवांगाम परियोजना के जी जी एस III से जी जी एस I तक पाइपलाइन बिछाना

राज्य—गुजरात

जिला—कैर

तालुका—मातर

गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
धनसोली	304 भाग	0	9	75
	304 भाग	0	5	10
	305 भाग	0	12	00
	305 भाग	0	4	50
	305 भाग	0	6	00
	305 भाग	0	8	10
	395	0	1	50
	290 भाग	0	4	50
	290 भाग	0	3	45
	289 भाग	0	29	40
	289 भाग	0	0	24
	287	0	4	50
	288	0	3	75
	267 भाग	0	4	65
	267 भाग (डब्ल्यू)	0	3	80
	263	0	12	00
	258	0	8	85
	249 भाग	0	10	20
	249 भाग	0	15	90
	248	0	9	15

[सं० 29(7)/68-आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

का० प्रा० 1132.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवांगाम तेल क्षेत्र में व्यवस्था स्थल कुंआ संख्या 39 बी क्यू से जी जी एस ii तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ;

2. अतः अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद् द्वारा घोषित किया है ।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्स (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय,

बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, रोड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सेंट्रल वर्कशाप के पास, बरोदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

### अनुसूची

39 बी क्यू से जी जी एस ii तक पाइपलाइन बिछाना

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—कैर	तालुका—मातर			
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर	
कठवाड़ा	157/1	0	2	52	

[सं० 29 (7)/68-आई-ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस्]

का० आ० 1133.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवागाम तेल क्षेत्र में व्ययन स्थल कुआँ संख्या बी ए एफ 14 से जी जी एस ii तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

2. अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइपलाइन्स (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय, बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, रोड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सेंट्रल वर्कशाप के पास, बरोदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

### अनुसूची

(बी ए एफ 14 से जी जी सी एस i तक पाइप लाइन बिछाना)

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला — कैर	तालुका —मातर			
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर	
कठवाड़ा	266/2	0	3	48	
	350	0	1	50	
	351/2	0	4	80	

गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
कठवाड़ा-जारी	351/3	0	0	21
	353/1	0	1	56
	356/3	0	1	92
	354/1	0	4	20
	354/2	0	4	56
	355	0	1	68
	112/2	0	0	60
	138/2	0	0	60

[मं० 29(7)/68-आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

का० आ० 1134.-यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवागांस तेल क्षेत्र में व्यसन स्थल कुआ संख्या बी डी 29 से जी जी एम I तक पैट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाया जानी चाहिये और ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतदुपाय अतुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

2. अतः, अध. पैट्रोलियम, पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद द्वारा घोषित किया है।

3. उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गुजरात पाइप लाइन्स (तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग) के कार्यालय बरोदा के पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, शैड नं० 27, मकरपुरा रोड, सेंट्रल वर्कशॉप के पास, बरोदा-4 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा। ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चित यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

### अनुसूची

बी डी ई-29 से जी जी एम II तक पाइप लाइन बिछाना

राज्य-गुजरात	जिला-कैंग	तालुका-भातर		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर
कठवाड़ा	251/2/1	0	2	28
	252/1	0	2	08

[मं० 29(7)/68- आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

म० वे० शिव प्रसाद राव, अवर सचिव।

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION****(Department of Labour and Employment)***New Delhi, the 8th June 1970*

**S.O. 2177.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 706 dated the 28th February, 1962, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. K. Chopra to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Madhya Pradesh for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry.

[No. 21(2)/68-PF.I.]

**श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय****(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 8 जून, 1970

**का० आ० 2177.**—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 706 तारीख 28 फरवरी, 1962 को अधिकांत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री आर० के० चोपड़ा को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियन्त्रणाधीन स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित स्थापन के संबंध में सम्पूर्ण मध्य प्रदेश राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं 21 (2) / 68-पी० एफ० I]

*New Delhi, the 9th June 1970*

**S.O. 2178.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment S.O. No. 3761 dated the 5th December, 1962, in so far as it relates to Shri U. H. Sainani, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri U. H. Sainani to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Gujarat for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or controlled industry.

[No. A. 12015(1)/70-PF.I.]

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 1970

**का० आ० 2178.**—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 3761 तारीख 5 दिसम्बर, 1962 को, जहाँ तक इसका संबंध श्री यू० एच० सेनानी से है, अधिकांत करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री यू० एच० सेनानी को उक्त अधिनियम के और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियन्त्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल-क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में सम्पूर्ण गुजरात राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए० 12015 (1) / 70-पी० एफ० I.]



**S.O. 2179.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the late Department of Social Security S.O. No. 3777 dated 23rd October, 1964, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. Gururaja, Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner (Grade I) to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Andhra Pradesh for the purposes of the said Act or of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to an establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government, or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil field or a controlled industry.

[No. 18(20)/68-P.F.I.]

**का० आ० 2179.**—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व सामाजिक सुरक्षा विभाग की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 3777 तारीख 23 अक्टूबर, 1964 को अधिक्रांत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री आर० गुरुराजा, सहायक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त (ग्रेड I) को, उक्त अधिनियम या उस के अधीन बनाई गई किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार की या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में सम्पूर्ण आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य के लिए एतद्द्वारा निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है ।

[सं० 18(20)/68-पी०एफ० I]

**S.O. 2180.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1487 dated the 4th June, 1960, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. N. Misra to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Bihar for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(11)/68-P.F.I.]

**का० आ० 2180.**—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1487 तारीख 4 जून, 1960 को अधिक्रांत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा श्री के० एन० मिश्रा को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में सम्पूर्ण बिहार राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है ।

[सं० 20(11)/68-पी०एफ० II]

*New Delhi, the 12th June 1970*

**S.O. 2181.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1367, dated the 18th May, 1960, in so far as it relates to Shri A. A. Bhaskar, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. A. Bhaskar to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Gujarat for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry.

[No. A. 12015(1)/70-P.F.I.]

B. K. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली 12 जून, 1970

क्र० आ० 2181.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1367 तारीख 18 मई, 1960 को, जहाँ तक इसका संबंध श्री० ए०ए० भास्कर से है, अधिकांत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री ए०ए० भास्कर को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके अंतर्गत विरचित किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजन, के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में या किसी रेल बम्बनी, महामत्तन, खाद्य या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से सम्बन्धित स्वामन के सम्बन्ध में सम्पूर्ण गुजरात राज्य के लिए निरिक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए० 12015(1)/70-पी० एफ० I]

बी० के० सक्सेना, अवसर सचिव।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 9th June 1970

S.O. 2182.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Punjab Cooperative Bank Limited, Amritsar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th June, 1970.

BEFORE SHRI P. P. R. SAWHNY, B. A. (HONS) CANTAB BAR-AT-LAW.  
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CHANDIGARH

REFERENCE NO. 2/C OF 1970

BETWEEN

The workmen and the management of the Punjab Cooperative Bank Limited, Amritsar.

APPEARANCES:

Thakar Durga Dass, concerned workman, with Shri Tek Chand Sharma.  
Shri Ved Pal Suri—for the respondent Bank.

AWARD

An industrial dispute having arisen between the workmen and the management of the Punjab Cooperative Bank Limited, regarding the matter given below, the Central Government in pursuance of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the same to this Tribunal for adjudication *vide* Labour and Employment Department' Notification No. 23/6/70-LR III, dated 10th March, 1970:—

Whether the demand for payment of enhanced conveyance charges to Shri Thakar Durga Dass of the Punjab Cooperative Bank Limited, Jullundur City, for attending to the clearing work is justified? If so, to what relief is he entitled?

2. The reference was fixed for filing of written statement by the respondent management, but before it could be done, the authorised representative of the management and Thakar Durga Dass, concerned workman, appeared and expressed a desire to make statements. Accordingly their statements were recorded.

3. The authorised representative of the management, Shri Ved Pal Suri, has stated that there had been a settlement regarding the dispute between the management and Thakar Durga Dass, concerned workman, to the effect that the conveyance charges of Thakar Durga Dass, clearing clerk, will be Rs. 25/- per month instead of Rs. 15/- per month from the date of reference and that an award may be given accordingly.

4. Thakar Durga Dass, concerned workman, who heard the statement made by Shri Ved Pal Suri, has stated that he endorsed it and added that an award may be given accordingly.

5. In view of the statements made by Shri Ved Pal Suri, the authorised representative of the management and Thakar Durga Dass, the concerned workman, that the dispute had been settled between them out of court and it had been agreed that the conveyance allowance of Thakar Durga Dass, clearing clerk, will be enhanced to Rs. 25/- per month from the date of reference, an award is given that Thakar Durga Dass, clearing clerk, will be entitled to conveyance allowance @ Rs. 25/- per month instead of Rs. 15/- per month from the date of reference.

(Sd.) P. P. R. SAWHNY,

Presiding Officer,

Central Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh.

[No. 23/6/70/LR.III.]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

### (Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 9th June 1970

**S.O. 2183.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (3) and (4) of section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. S. Menon, Chief Engineer, Cochin Port Trust as Chairman and Member of the Cochin Dock Labour Board vice Shri K. P. K. Menon, granted leave for fourteen days from the 6th May, 1970 and makes the following further amendment in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. 3074 dated the 23rd August, 1968, namely:—

In the said Notification, for the words "Shri K. P. K. Menon" in both the places where they occur, the words "Shri P. S. Menon" shall be substituted.

[No. 55/9/69-Fac.II.]

C. RAMDAS, Deputy Secy.

### (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 1970

**क्र० आ० 2183**—डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5क की उपधाराओं (3) और (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी० एस० मेनन, मुख्य इंजीनियर, कोचीन पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, को श्री के० पी० के० मेनन, जिन्हें 6 मई, 1970 से 14 दिन की छुट्टी मंजूर की गई है, के स्थान पर कोचीन डॉक श्रम बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष और सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० 3074 तारीख 23 अगस्त, 1968 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "श्री के० पी० के० मेनन" शब्दों के, उन दोनों स्थानों में जहाँ वे आते हैं, स्थान पर "श्री पी० एस० मेनन" शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[सं० 55/9/69-फैक II]

सी० रामदास, उप सचिव, पीडी

*New Delhi, the 10th June 1970*

**S.O. 2184.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Arbitrator, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Calcutta Port Commissioners and their workmen represented by the Calcutta Port Shramik Union, Calcutta, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th June, 1970.

#### BEFORE SHRI L. P. DAVE, ARBITRATOR

In the matter of a reference under sec. 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, in respect of an industrial dispute between employers in relation to the Calcutta Port Commissioners, Calcutta, and their workmen.

#### APPEARANCES:

*On behalf of employers:*—Shri G. V. Karlekar, Labour Adviser and Industrial Relations Officer, Calcutta Port Commissioners.

*On behalf of workmen:*—Shri Makhan Chatterji, General Secretary, Calcutta Port Shramik Union.

Shri Prasanta Kumar Datta, Vice-President Haldia Port and Dock Shramik Union.

Shri Santosh Kar, Secretary, National Union of Waterfront Workers.

#### AWARD

An industrial dispute existed between the employers in relation to the Calcutta Port Commissioners and their workmen represented by Calcutta Port Shramik Union. They entered into an agreement on 14th November, 1969 under sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act agreeing to refer the said dispute to my arbitration and forwarded a copy of the said agreement to the Central Government as required by sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act. The Central Government then published it in the official gazette on 6th January, 1970 under the said sub-section.

2. The specific matters in dispute referred to me were as under:—

1. What should be the rate of payment to the casual workers employed at Haldia in unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled categories and what other benefits they should be entitled to?

2. What should be the rate of over-time payment to such workmen?

3. Whether the demand of the Amin Mistries at Haldia for payment of a conveyance allowances is justified? If so, what should be the amount?

3. In response to notices issued by me, the Calcutta Port Shramik Union filed their written statement relating to the matters referred to me and the Calcutta Port Commissioners filed their rejoinder. The matter was then fixed for hearing from 6th April, and notices were issued to the parties. In the meanwhile, the Haldia Port and Dock Shramik Union sent an application requesting that their Union should be implicated in the matter. When the matter came up for hearing on 6th April, after hearing the parties it was ordered, in view of sec. 10A, sub-section (3A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, that this Union would be given an opportunity of presenting their case before the Arbitrator. After this, at the request of the parties, I visited Haldia on 7th April and saw several places of work shown by representatives of the parties who had accompanied me. At the further request of parties, and on their agreeing to extend the period of my making the award by 14th August, 1970, the hearing was adjourned to 11th May. Before this date, the National Union of Water Front Workers sent an application for being joined as a party. After hearing parties on 11th May, it was ordered that this Union would also be given an opportunity of presenting their case.

4. At the hearing, Shri Datta and Shri Kar stated that they endorsed the written statement filed by the Calcutta Port Shramik Union. Actually, Shri Makhan Chatterji, General Secretary, Calcutta Port Shramik Union, was the main spokesman on behalf of the workmen before me.

5. Two witnesses (*viz.*, Shri Ajitkumar Maity and Shri Shyam Pada Das) were examined on behalf of the workmen. No oral evidence was led on behalf of the employers. Both the employers and Unions, however, filed several papers before me.

6. The present dispute relates to some of the workers working at Haldia. It may be noted that because of several difficulties in the working of Calcutta Port,

it has been decided to establish an auxiliary Port at Haldia and the work of construction is now going on and this is known as Haldia Dock Project. Because the work is now under construction, a number of workmen have to be employed as casual workers and the main dispute in this case relates to the wages payable to these casual workers. I was told that the number of casual workers now working at Haldia are (1) unskilled, 591; (2) semi-skilled, 74; (3) skilled, 35; total 700.

7. It appears that large number of these workers were engaged in about November–December 1968. It further appears that in the beginning they were being paid Rs. 5.08 per day for unskilled workers; Rs. 5.83 per day for semi-skilled workers and Rs. 6.58 per day for the skilled workers. It is an admitted fact that this included a built-in element of 0.50 Paise per day for over-time; that is, no over-time was paid separately, but every one was being paid 0.50 Paise per day, whether he had done over-time work or not and whatever period he worked over-time. It also appears that at that time, the hours of work ranged from six to twelve per day with a recess in between.

8. On 5th July, 1969, the Calcutta Port Shramik Union served a notice of strike on the Calcutta Port Commissioners. (This notice is at annexure A to the written statement of the Port Commissioners). It contained 11 demands. It appears that some discussions took place between the parties in the presence of Assistant Labour Commissioner, Calcutta, as a result of which a settlement was arrived at on 8th August, 1969. (A copy of this settlement is at annexure B to the written statement of the Calcutta Port Commissioners; it is also at annexure IV of the written statement of the Calcutta Port Shramik Union). Para I of the terms of settlement dealt with the 11 demands referred to in notice of strike and the agreement in respect thereof. Para II mentioned that the parties would refer three issues mentioned therein to arbitration and it is in terms thereof that the present arbitration agreement was arrived at.

#### *Issue No. 1.*

9. The first question referred to me is as to what should be rate of payment to the casual workers employed at Haldia in unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled categories. Before proceeding further, I may mention that it was urged on behalf of the workers that the work that is being done by the so-called casual workers at Haldia is a work of permanent type and hence these workers should not be treated as casual workers but they must be considered as permanent workers. I can deal with questions which have been specifically referred to me. The question referred to me is as to what should be the rate of payment to the casual workers. I have not been asked to decide whether a particular worker or category should be considered casual or permanent, which question would depend upon type of work they are engaged in. As I have been asked only to fix the wages of casual workers, I cannot go in to the question whether a particular category or categories of workmen are doing work of a casual or permanent nature, or to decide whether they are casual or permanent.

10. In this connection, Shri Makhan Chatterji contended that sec. 13 of the Calcutta Port Act requires the Port Commissioners to prepare and sanction a schedule of the staff of employees whom they deem it necessary and proper to maintain for the purposes of the Act. He contended that the workers at the oil-jetty could not be engaged on a casual basis and the Commissioners had, therefore, infringed the provisions of sec. 13 of the Calcutta Port Act. I am not expressing any opinion as to whether there has been any infringement of the said section, as I am of the view that it is beyond the scope of the matters referred to me.

11. It was then contended that the so-called casual workers must be paid on monthly basis and I must fix their wages on a monthly basis. This is also a matter which I cannot go in to. Whether the work requires a casual worker to be engaged per day or per month would depend on facts of each case. The employer has the right to decide this. I have not been asked to go in to question whether the payment should be on a monthly basis or daily basis. Even if the Calcutta Port Commissioners have on other occasions employed temporary workers for temporary work on a monthly basis, it will not be open to me to decide that the casual workers at Haldia should be paid on monthly basis. Actually, no demand for fixing wages on a monthly basis was made either in the demands given in the strike notice or in the written statement.

12. I would, therefore, fix the wages both on monthly basis and on a daily basis and the workmen will be entitled to the appropriate scales, depending on whether the workmen are monthly rated or daily rated.

13. The question then is as to what wages should be paid to the casual workers at Haldia. The workers' demand is that they should get the same basic wages, the same dearness allowance, the same city compensatory allowance and the same house rent allowance as is payable to the workers doing similar kind of work at Calcutta itself. In addition, the workers' demand that looking to the conditions in which they have to work, they should be given 40 per cent more as project allowance.

14. Before proceeding further, it may be noted that the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports, in its report dated 29th November, 1969, have made recommendations about the wage structure for the workers working at the eight major Ports of India including Calcutta. Para 6(9) of this Report (Page 320 of the cyclostyled copy) mentions the categories of the employees covered by the Board. Sub-para (1)(a) lays down that all the categories of class III and class IV employees irrespective of nature of work and place of posting employed by the Port—authorities of Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Vishakhapatnam, Cochin, marmugao; Kandia and Paradeep should be brought within the scope of wage fixation proposed by the Board. There is a note below this sub-para. It mentions "Labour members wanted the words 'including Haldia' to be added after Calcutta, i.e., they wanted that all workers at Haldia should have the same wage structure (including C.A. and H.R.A.) as the workers at Calcutta. Employer—members agreed to workers recruited at Haldia getting same basic pay and dearness allowance, but not necessarily to the city allowance and house rent allowance".

15. The recommendations of the Wage Board have been accepted by the Government and, I understand, are being implemented by the different ports. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the workers at Haldia are entitled to the same basic pay and the same dearness allowance as their counterparts get at Calcutta and at other ports. It may also be mentioned here that the Wage Board has recommended identical basic scales and identical dearness allowances for all eight major ports. They have, however, recommended different rates of city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance for the different ports.

16. So far as the basic pay is concerned, the Wage Board has recommended a scale of 100—2—120—EB—2—130 for unskilled workers. It has recommended two scales for semi-skilled workers and they are (1) 110—2½—120—3—135—EB—3—147 and (2) 115—3—136—4—140—EB—4—160. The Wage Board has also recommended one interim scale which is 104—2—116—3—131—EB—3—140. It is not clear whether this scale applies to unskilled workers or semi-skilled workers. I need not go in this question because the workers will have to be put in the appropriate scale according to the nature of work they are doing. A worker at Haldia will have to be paid the same basic pay as a worker during identical work in Calcutta.

17. So far as skilled category is concerned, the Wage Board has recommended three scales and they are (1) 150—4—170—5—190; (2) 166—4—170—5—195; and (3) 190—8—254. It may be noted, however, that these are not three separate scales but they are three segments of one scale. A worker will have to pass a trade test before he is allowed to go from first segment to the second or from the second segment to the third. So also, a worker, if he passes the trade test, is automatically promoted to the higher segment and has not to be held up on the ground of there being no vacancy. These matters have been dealt with at paras 8.46 to 8.49 (pages 513 to 515 of the cyclostyled copy) of the Wage Board Report. As it would take nine years before worker goes to the top of the first segment, by which time casual work will be completed, I would prescribe only the first-segment of the scale for the casual workers at Haldia.

18. In other words, I would prescribe the following basic scales for the monthly rated casual workers at Haldia.

Unskilled.—100—2—120—EB—2—130;

Semi-skilled.—(1) 110—2½—120—3—135—EB—3—147.

(2) 115—3—136—4—140—EB—4—160.

Skilled.—150—4—170—5—190.

I also prescribe a scale of 104—2—116—3—131—EB—3—140, as the scale in between unskilled and Semi-skilled category. This scale will apply to these workmen, who may be doing the same kind of work as Workers at Calcutta drawing the same scale of pay.

19. Having dealt with the monthly rated scales, I proceed to consider the scales of pay which should be given to the daily rated workers. In my opinion, the

proper course would be to divide the monthly pay by 30 and give that pay as daily rate of pay to the worker with the proviso that on completion of 6 days continuous work, the workman will be entitled to a paid off-day at the same rate. It is an admitted fact that this is the practice which is now prevalent at Haldia, and I do not want to make any departure from it. To make the position more clear, I may mention that starting basic pay of an unskilled worker will be Rs. 3.33 per day. The daily wage of a semi-skilled worker who is put in the first of semi-skilled scales starting with 110 will be 3.67 per day. A semi-skilled worker in second scale starting with 115 will get 3.83 per day. A skilled worker will start with 5.00 per day. The daily starting wage of a person corresponding the scale of 104—2—116—3—140 will be 3.47 per day.

20. I would also make it clear that the casual workers will be entitled to earn an annual increment on completion of a year's service. There is no reason why a casual worker should remain at the minimum scale, in spite of his working for over a year. Hence even daily rated workers would also be entitled to earn increments on completion of a year's service.

21. Having dealt with the basic wages, I come to the question of dearness allowances. I have no difficulty in fixing dearness allowance at Rs. 72 per month for those workers whose monthly basic pay is up to Rs. 139. For persons whose monthly basic pay is from Rs. 140 to 170, the dearness allowance would be Rs. 99 per month. It would be Rs. 123 per month for pay range of Rs. 180 to 239. Daily rated workers will get 1/30 of the monthly rate per day. The corresponding daily rate of dearness allowance will be Rs. 2.40, Rs. 3.30, and 4.10 respectively.

22. The rates of dearness allowance will be revised every six months on the same lines as the workers at Calcutta; and the Haldia workers will get dearness allowance at the new rates as applied to Calcutta. In case of daily rated workers, the daily rate of dearness allowance will be arrived at by dividing the monthly rate by 30.

23. This brings me to the question of city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance. The Wage Board has recommended, for the employees of the Calcutta Port, city compensatory allowance at 10 per cent of their basic pay and the house rent allowance at 16 per cent of their basic pay subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per month. The Unions demand that the workers at Haldia also be given the city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance at the same rates.

24. At one stage, I was feeling very doubtful whether workers at Haldia should be entitled to city compensatory allowance and the house rent allowance payable to the workers at Calcutta. The city compensatory allowance is meant to compensate workers for the high cost of living in a big city. Similarly the house rent allowance is meant for compensating the workers for the higher rents they have to pay in large cities. Haldia is not part of Calcutta, but is about 60 miles down stream. It could not be said that Haldia is as costly as Calcutta nor could it be said that there are high rents there. I need not, however, go deeper in this question because Calcutta Port Commissioners have passed a resolution No. 309 on 28th March, 1955 that staff of all categories living outside municipal limits of Calcutta, would be entitled to city compensatory allowance. Under the establishment schedule of 1969-70 Part I, it has been laid down that employees of all categories are eligible for house rent allowance irrespective of their place of residence and irrespective of the place of their duty. It was conceded before me that Calcutta Port employees, who are working at Sagar Light House which is 81 miles from Calcutta and other employees who are working at other stations down the river, are being paid city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance at Calcutta rates. If this is so, non-granting of city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance to employees at Haldia would amount to unfair discrimination.

25. The only argument which Mr. Karleker advanced in this connection was that these casual employees at Haldia are not employees of the Calcutta Port Commissioners but they are employees of the Haldia Dock Project. Haldia Dock Project is not an employer. It is one of the projects of the Calcutta Port Commissioners and persons working in this project are employees of the Calcutta Port Commissioners. Admittedly Haldia Dock Project is controlled by Calcutta Port Commissioners. The arbitration agreement in the present case also shows that the dispute was between the Calcutta Port Commissioners and their workmen. I hold that the workers in the present case are employees of Calcutta Port Commissioners.

26. I, therefore, hold that the casual workers at Haldia are entitled to city compensatory allowance at the rate of 10 per cent of their basic pay and house rent allowance at the rate of 16 per cent of their basic pay subject to minimum of Rs. 20 per month in the case of monthly rated workers and Rs. 0.67 paise per day in the case of daily rated workers.

27. This brings me to the claim of workers to the project allowance. It was contended that workers at Paradeep Port are being paid Project allowance equal to 40 per cent of their basic pay. When a new project is started, people have to work in out of the way places where they have no normal amenities or facilities. There are difficulties of housing, difficulties of transport and difficulties of obtaining normal requirements. To compensate people for this and to induce people to go to such places for work a project allowance is generally granted, which project allowance is gradually reduced and ultimately stopped when normal facilities are made available. It is on this ground that the workmen are claiming a project allowance here also.

28. It is true that the normal facilities are not available at Haldia at present. It has, however, to be remembered that the casual workers are local people, recruited locally. It is not that they are being asked to go there from out side. Hence there is no question of giving them an inducement by way of project allowance. They have been used to this kind of life, that is, a life without amenities, available elsewhere and to them it is not much of a hardship to work there. Again, they are being given a city compensatory allowance and also house rent allowance, though as I said above, they are local people and the rents are not high. Further, the Government, when sanctioning project allowance for different schemes, make a rule that casual workers are not entitled to project allowance. Lastly the total pay packet of these workers, (even without project allowance) would compare very favourably with the pay packet of workers employed by other employers at Haldia. Considering all these facts, I reject the claim of the workers to get the project allowance.

29. This brings me to the second part of point 1 referred to me and it is "what other benefits the workers should be entitled to?". In this connection, the Calcutta Port Shramik Union has claimed several benefits under clauses (a) to (s) of para 29 of their written statement. Clauses (a) to (d) deal with scales of pay, dearness allowance, city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance. Clause (g) deals with over-time pay which is the subject matter of issue No. 2 referred to me. Clause (k) deals with construction allowance (Project allowance). I have already dealt with the workers' demands in respect of claims (a) to (d) & (k) and shall deal with clause (g) when I come to the question of over-time under issue No. 2.

30. Coming to the other clauses, clause (e) deals with leave; clause (f) deals with festival holidays; clause (h) relates to medical benefits; clause (i) relates to uniforms and soap; clause (j) to retirement benefits; clause (l) is a general and vague clause and clauses (m) to (s) deal with provisions for hospital, ambulance, cheap canteens etc.

31. It was contended on behalf of Calcutta Port Commissioners that the demands made by the union in respect of the above clauses are out side my scope. It was urged that the benefits referred to in first issue relate to benefits which can be said to form part of the wage structure. In this connection, I was referred to the demands contained in the notice of strike dated 5th July, 1969 and the terms of settlement dated 8th August, 1969. None of the demands related to leave or festival holidays. Demand (1) related to implementation of rates of wages of the casual workers, Demand (2) related to the benefits of weekly off day, working hours and extra hours for over-time, Demand No. 3 related to a project allowance and also allowances such as city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance. Under the terms of settlement, these three demands were taken together and it was agreed as an *ad-interim measure* that the casual workmen employed at Haldia should be paid revised scales as mentioned therein and it was further agreed that this payment was for a normal day's work of eight hours only and if they were required to work over and above this, they would be entitled to over-time. After this, the other demands were referred to one after the other and agreements were arrived at. Lastly it was agreed that parties should refer three issues to arbitration.

32. It was argued from this that what was agreed to be referred to arbitration was only questions arising out of the notice of demand and no extraneous matters can be gone into now. On the other hand, it was urged on behalf of the workmen



that we must take the wording of reference as it is and the wording is sufficiently wide to cover benefits as now demanded by the workmen.

33. There is great force in the contention raised by the employers. The agreement to arbitration came as a result of the notice of strike, which contained II demands and the agreements arrived at between the parties in relation thereto. As I mentioned earlier, at the time of settlement, issues No. 1 to 3 were taken together and the agreement in respect thereof was arrived at as an *ad-interim measure*. It is mainly in respect thereof that reference to arbitration was made. Reference to the arbitration should be read in light of the back ground. I may repeat that there was no demand in the notice of strike for leave or for festival holidays and the employers are justified in contending that if they knew that this question was also to be referred to arbitration, they may not have agreed thereto. In my opinion, looking to the demands contained in the notice of strike and looking in to the terms of settlement, I think that the words "other benefits" would mean only benefits relating to wage structure. In my opinion, therefore, I can not go in to demands contained in clauses (e), (f), (h), (i), (j) and (l) to (s) of para 29 of the written statement of the Port Shramik Union.

34. I may also mention here that so far as clauses (m) to (s) are concerned, there can not be any doubt that it is desirable to make provisions for these facilities. They are for hospitals, an ambulance, cheap canteens, family quarters, recreation activities, library, etc. and I hope that the Commissioners would take early action in the matter. Similarly regarding the demand for soap, it has to be supplied, when the work is of dirty nature and I am sure that the Commissioners will look into this matter sympathetically.

35. Regarding demand (f) which is for festival holidays, it does not form part of the matters referred to in the agreement. It, however, appears from annexure V of the written statement of Calcutta Port Shramik Union that the Additional Chief Engineer of Haldia Dock Project wrote a letter to the Union on 22nd December, 1969. In clause 11 thereof it has been mentioned that pending settlement by the arbitrator, five days mentioned therein would be treated as holidays with pay. Because of this letter, I would now consider the claim of workers to get festival holidays. It was urged that the permanent employees are given 19 holidays and 2 days of casual leave in a year and there should be no distinction between permanent and temporary employees in this respect. It may be remembered that the workers with whom we are now concerned are casual workers. They can be compared to 'B' and 'C' category workers of the Calcutta Port, who may or may not get the work throughout month. The question of festival holidays for B and C categories of workers was referred to adjudication and it was held that five holidays were sufficient for them. As I mentioned above, the casual workers can be compared with B and C categories workers and if these categories workers in Calcutta get five festival holidays, it would be sufficient for the casual workers at Haldia to get the same number of holidays.

#### Issue No. 2:

36. This issue relates to payment of over-time allowance. As mentioned earlier, originally the workers were not being paid a separate over-time allowance; but a payment of 0.50 Paise per day was made to all workers to cover over-time work that they may be required to do. At that time, hours of work varied from six to twelve (with a recess). Under the agreement dated 8th August, 1969, wages of the workers were fixed for a normal day's work of 8 hours only and if they are required to work more than this, they are entitled to over-time. It is an admitted fact that over-time is now being paid, but it is paid at the normal rate i.e., 1/8 of the above rate per hour. Under Rule 25 of Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950, the extra wages for over-time are dealt with. It lays down that when a worker works in an employment for more than nine hours on any day or more than forty eight hours in any week, he shall, in respect of over-time work, be entitled to wages at double the ordinary rate of wages. The workers at Calcutta are being paid over-time at this rate and there is no reason why the workers at Haldia should get over-time at a lesser rate. I would direct that the payment of over-time will be at double the ordinary rates when the worker works for more than nine hours on any day or more than forty eight hours in any week.

#### Issue No. 3:

37. This issue deals with demand of a conveyance allowance for Amin Mistries. There are at present 29 Amin Mistries working at Haldia. Admittedly the duty of Amin Mistries is to assist supervisory staff of Civil Engineering works.

38. It is an admitted position that the area at Haldia is divided in three sectors and the area of each sector is about three square miles. The Amin Mistries are in charge of one sector each, and have, for their work, to move about in this area. They live in camps. As there are no canteens or other facilities to get food, they have to return to the camps during recess for food and then again go back for duty. They have, therefore, to perform at least two trips. Again as the area is still under development, there are no facilities of transport like Buses as in Calcutta. Probably because of all these difficulties, the supervisory staff at Haldia is being paid Rs. 30 per month as conveyance allowance. The Amin Mistries have to assist the supervisory staff and have, therefore, to move about almost as much. If the supervisory staff is given a conveyance allowance, there is no reason why the Amin Mistries should not get the same.

39. In course of arguments, Shri Karlekar conceded that the difficulties of Amin Mistries were genuine. He, however, said that giving a conveyance allowance would not solve the difficulties. He urged that they may be given a cycle allowance provided they keep a cycle. He further stated that if an advance was necessary for the purchase of a cycle, the Commissioners would give such advance. In my opinion, there is great force in this contention. Mere payment of allowance would not solve the difficulties of the workers because in that case they would have to continue walking the distance. I would, therefore, order that the Amin Mistries should be given a cycle allowance of Rs. 15 per month provided they maintain a cycle.

40. The last question which has then to be considered is the day from which my award will come into force. The workers have demanded that it should come in force at least from 1st January, 1969. The workers gave notice of strike on 5th July, 1969 and under the terms of agreement entered on 8th August, 1969, a new wage rate was fixed as an *ad-interim measure* from 1st August, 1969. In my opinion, the new rates which I have fixed including over-time and also cycle allowance should come into effect from that date i.e., 1st August, 1969.

41. My Award, therefore, would be as under:—

(1) Casual workers at Haldia should be paid basic wages, dearness allowance, compensatory allowance and House Rent allowance at the following rates:—

#### I. Basic Wages

(a) Monthly rated workers:—

Unskilled—100—2—120—EB—2—130.

Interim between unskilled & Semi skilled—104—2—116—3—131—EB—3—140.

Semi skilled—110—2½—120—3—135—EB—3—147.

Semi skilled—115—3—136—4—140—EB—4—160.

Skilled—150—4—170—5—190.

(b) Daily rated workers:—

The daily rate will be arrived at by dividing the monthly rate by 30. Daily rated workers will on completion of six days continuous work be entitled to a paid off-day at the same rate. They will also earn increments on completion of a year's work.

(c) The worker will be placed in the appropriate scale, looking to the nature of work he is performing and the pay a worker doing similar work at Calcutta is getting.

#### II. Dearness Allowance

(a) Monthly rated:

Amount of Dearness Allowance per month

Rs. 72

Rs. 99

Rs. 123

Basic pay range

up to Rs. 139

140 to 179

180 to 239

(b) Daily rated:

The daily Dearness Allowance will be 1/30 of the monthly Dearness Allowance for the appropriate scale.

- (c) Rates of Dearness Allowance will be revised every six months. The revision will take place at the same time as at Calcutta and the new rates will be the same.

### III. Compensatory Allowance

Both monthly rated and daily rated workers will be paid compensatory allowance equal to 10 per cent of the basic wage.

### IV. House Rent Allowance

Both monthly rated and daily rated workers will be paid house rent allowance at the rate of 16 per cent of basic wage, subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per month in case of monthly rated workers and Rs. 0.67 Paise per day in case of daily rated workers.

2. Workers will be paid over-time at double the ordinary rates when they work for more than nine hours on any day or more than forty eight hours in any week.

3. Amin Mistries will be paid cycle allowance at the rate of Rs. 15 per month provided they maintain a cycle.

4. The award will be effective from 1st August, 1969. The arrears from 1st August, 1969 to 30th June, 1970 will be paid before 30th September, 1970.

5. No order as to costs.

Dated 1st June, 1970.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, Arbitrator.  
[No. 28/94/69-Fac.II/P&D.]

New Delhi, the 1st June 1970

**S.O. 2185.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Licensed Measurers and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th June, 1970.

## CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 6 of 1970

### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Licensed Measurers.

AND

Their workmen.

### PRESENT:

Shri B. N. Banerjee, Presiding officer.

### APPEARANCES:

*On behalf of Employers.*—Sri Arijit Chowdhury, Counsel with Sri D. Basu Thakur, Legal Adviser, Bengal Chamber of Commerce.

*On behalf of Workmen.*—Sri D. L. Sen Gupta, Advocate.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Port & Dock.

### AWARD

By Order No. 28(80)/69-Fac.II, dated February 7, 1970, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), referred the following industrial dispute between the management of Calcutta Licensed Measurers and their workmen represented by (i) Calcutta Port & Dock Workers Union and (ii) National Union of Waterfront Workers, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, namely:

“Whether the demand of the Measuring Porters and Gearmen of the Calcutta Licensed Measurers for wages for the period of closure/lockout from 3rd December 1968 to 27th January, 1969 is justified? If so, to what extent?”

2. There were two written statements filed on behalf of the workmen, one by the Calcutta Port and Dock Workers Union and the other by the National Union of Waterfront Workers. The management also filed a written statement. I need notice at the outset that it was no body's case that there was a "closure". Both the parties proceeded on the theory that there was a "lockout".

3. The case pleaded on behalf of the workmen represented by Calcutta Port & Dock Workers Union may be briefly stated as hereinafter. In the month of August 1968, the trade union raised a dispute demanding payment of proper wages for overtime work and pro-rata wages (equal to daily wages) for casual booking. The demands were not met by the management. Thereupon, on September 2, 1968, the trade union served a notice on the management stating that unless their demands were met, the workmen would refuse to accept bookings on Sundays and Holidays and also extra bookings on any day beyond their duty hours. At that stage, there was a conciliation meeting before the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Calcutta, but the proceedings did not yield any result. Thereafter, the management, it was alleged, resorted to repressive measures against their workmen, which included charging some workmen with charges of misconduct on vague and flimsy grounds and suspending two leading workmen. In paragraph 6 of the written statement it was pleaded:

"This provoked the workmen to declare that unless the suspension order against two workmen are withdrawn all the Measuring porters and Gearmen will consider themselves as if they were also suspended from duty."

Thereupon, on December 2, 1968 the management closed down the business with the object of victimising the workmen. In paragraphs 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the statement it was pleaded:

"10. The union thereafter approached all concerned including the Labour Ministry, Government of India to bring a settlement on the dispute.

11. The Regional Labour Commissioner (C), by his letter February 4th, 1969, informed the union that the Management is willing not to proceed with the chargesheets served on 13 Measuring Porters and further willing to revoke suspension orders.

12. On the 5th February 1969 the union was further informed that the Ministry of Labour & Employment have issued order prohibiting continuance of strike and indicated that if the strike is called off the Labour Minister will meet the parties on the 7th February 1969 at Delhi.

13. Thereafter the strike was called off on the 6th of February, 1969 and all the workmen including Gearmen and Measuring porters resumed their duties."

After the lifting of the lockout, it was alleged, the management made an agreement with the officers' association and the employees' union in terms of which 25 days' salary was paid for the period of lockout and the remaining period was adjusted against leave account. The same agreement, however, was not made with Measuring Porters and Gearmen. The prayer made in the written statement was for payment of 25 days' wages to the Measuring Porters and Gearmen along with adjustment of the remaining days with leave due or to be earned in future.

4. The case pleaded by the workmen represented by the National Union of Waterfront Workers may be briefly related as follows. It was pleaded in paragraph 3:

"That there was an agitation of the workmen, represented by the trade unions working amongst them over the long standing grievances like (a) enhanced rate of payment of extra booking (b) payment of double the hourly rates of wages for work done during recess i.e. (meal hours) Sunday and holidays and when all peaceful and constitutional agitation failed to get any redress, the workers had to take recourse to a strike on 19th November 1968 and continued the same till 3rd December 1968 when the Company declared Lockout."

It was further pleaded in paragraph 5:

"That the Company having declared lockout on 3rd December 1968 both the trade Unions made every effort on and from 3rd December 1968 to negotiate and settle the matter of "Lockout" urging upon the Company to withdraw the same and resume normal activities and even demonstrations led by trade union leaders like Sri Indrajit Gupta, M.P. Late Pranab Ganguly, Sri Prasanta Dutta and Sri Nazrul Ahmed were staged before the Bengal Chamber of Commerce and Indian Chambers of

Commerce on 10th December 1968, 20th December 1968 and 5th January 1969 demanding immediate lifting of Lockout, but without any effect."

It was also pleaded in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the written statement:

"7. That at the intervention of the Central Labour Minister the outstanding disputes over which the strike was taken recourse to initially was referred to for Arbitration by agreement of the parties, now pending before this Tribunal, being No. ABN 1 of 1969 and this Lockout was lifted.

3. That since lifting of the Lockout the Company not only did not pay wages to the workers but also took recourse to descriminate\* \* \* \* by paying the same to a section of the workmen only as different from the others while the agitation for wages was by all workers. The number of workmen who were not paid wages for the aforesaid period of lockout will be about 300, namely the measuring porters, Gearmen, reserve workers were not paid\* \* \* \*

According to the stand taken by the National Union of Water-front Workers the commencement and the continuance of the lockout were both unjustified and malafide and the course was resorted to only to victimise the workmen. In the aforesaid circumstances, they claimed, that full wages should be paid to the workmen for the entire period of lockout.

5. The case pleaded by the management in the written statement was:

- (a) the existing rates of Overtime, extra shift bookings and Sunday/Holiday booking were in accordance with the Settlements, dated 2-3-55 and 22-4-63. Further, by a settlement, dated 1-10-64 (which was to be in force for 5 years), both the two Unions agreed that all the terms and conditions not covered by this agreement would continue as usual (meaning as per old settlements).
- (b) without terminating those settlements, as stated above, the Measuring Porters and Gearmen started agitation for revision of the rates for overtime, extra shift bookings and Sunday/holidays booking since June 1968.
- (c) while the matter was pending before the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), the Measuring Porters and Gearmen refused to accept overtime work on and from 16th August, 1968.
- (d) on or about 2nd September 1968, the Calcutta Port & Dock Workers' Union informed the employers that unless double wages were paid for extra shift bookings and Sunday/holidays bookings the Measuring Porters and Gearmen would also refuse to accept bookings on Sunday/holidays and extra shift booking after 16th September, 1968. Thereupon the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), directed both the Unions of the workmen, by a letter dated 4th September 1968, not to go on strike from September 16, 1968 and to maintain status quo. That direction went unheeded. So also went unheeded a notice by the management, dated September 19, 1968, asking the workmen to carry on their work.
- (e) the employers thereupon issued Show Cause notices to fourteen workmen for refusal to work overtime, in extra shift bookings, and in Sunday/holidays bookings.
- (f) on the 18th November, 1968, a deputation of hostile and agitated workmen came to meet Mr. K. K. Mitra, the then Secretary of the employers. In the said meeting, two workmen (Sk. Ibrahim and Sk. Sajid) shouted at the Secretary in a rude, hostile and unbecoming manner. The Secretary, therefore, asked them to leave his room but they refused to do so. The two workmen were therefore charged with misconduct and suspended with full wages.
- (g) in view of the suspension of the two workmen, as stated above, all the Measuring Porters and Gearmen stopped their normal work from 19th November 1968, without notice. The strikers not only went on illegal and unjustified strike from 19th November 1968, but also started intimidating and coercing the other members of the Staff attending to their duties, especially at the weighbridge and Scale Room. The strikers left weighing and measuring gears unattended in various vessels and offices and executives were not allowed to remove those gears. As a result, valuable weighing and measuring

gears were left on board of vessels, which sailed away from Calcutta for foreign ports. The position deteriorated so much that the employers had to obtain Orders from the Chief Presidency Magistrate, Calcutta, directing the officer-in-charge, South Port Police Station, to assist them to remove their weighing and measuring gears from various ships and Sheds.

(h) the situation deteriorated further and on 30th November 1968, the employers received a letter from the Staff of the Weighbridge informing that the lorries of various parties, which had come for weighing in the Weighbridge, were damaged by the strikers and some of the Khalasis were also injured by stone throwing strikers.

(i) since the strikers did not curb their lawless activities and also did not allow the loyal workers such as Clerical and Measuring Officers to attend their duties, the employers had no other alternative but to declare a lockout from 3rd December 1968, and Notice to that effect was affixed on the Notice Board.

6. It was further pleaded in the written statement that in obedience to a direction from the Regional Labour Commissioner, the management lifted the lockout on December 27, 1968 but the Measuring Porters and Gearmen did not call off the strike and continued to absent themselves from duties. It was not until the continuance of the strike was prohibited by the Regional Labour Commissioner, that the strikers cared to rejoin. In the aforesaid circumstances the management pleaded that the declaration of the lockout and its continuance were both justified and the workers were not entitled to any relief.

7. Now, lockout, as defined in Section 2(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, means "the closing of a place of employment, or the suspension of work, or the refusal by an employer to continue to employ any number of persons employed by him".

Sub-section (2) of Section 22 contains prohibition of lockouts of any public utility service in the following language:

"No employer carrying on any public utility service shall lock-out any of his workmen—

- (a) without giving them notice of lockout as hereinafter provided, within six weeks before locking out; or
- (b) within fourteen days of giving such notice; or
- (c) before the expiry of the date of lock-out specified in any such notice as aforesaid; or
- (d) during the pendency of any conciliation proceedings before a conciliation officer and seven days after the conclusion of such proceedings."

Section 23 contains certain penal provisions of strikes and lockouts couched in the following language:

"No workman who is employed in any industrial establishment shall go on strike in breach of contract and no employer of any such workman shall declare a lock-out—

- (a) during the pendency of conciliation proceedings before a Board and seven days after the conclusion of such proceedings;
- (b) during the pendency of proceedings before a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal and two months after the conclusion of such proceedings.
- (bb) during the pendency of arbitration proceedings before an arbitrator and two months after the conclusion of such proceedings, where a notification has been issued under sub-section (3A) of Section 10A;
- (c) during any period in which a settlement or award is in operation, in respect of any of the matter covered by the settlement or award."

Section 24 specifies when strikes and lock-outs are illegal, namely:

"24(1) A strike or a lock-out shall be illegal if—

- (i) it is commenced or declared in contravention of section 22 or section 23; or

- (ii) it is continued in contravention of an order made under sub-section (3) of section 10 (or sub-section 4A of section 10A).
- (2) Where a strike or lock-out in pursuance of an industrial dispute has already commenced and is in existence at the time of the reference of the dispute to a Board, (an arbitrator, a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal), the continuance of such strike, or lock-out shall not be deemed to be illegal, provided that such strike or lock-out was not at its commencement in contravention of the provisions of this Act or the continuance thereof was not prohibited under sub-section (3) of section 10 (or sub-section 4A of Section 10A).
- (3) A lock-out declared in consequence of an illegal strike or a strike declared in consequence of an illegal lock-out shall not be deemed to be illegal."

The provisions regarding public utility concerns need not concern me as the employer firm is admittedly not a public utility concern.

8. Mr. Chowdhury, learned Counsel for the management, contended that the strike called on November 19, 1968 was itself illegal because the strike was commenced without terminating the settlements over payment of overtime wages and payment for extra shift duty (Ex. 1, 2 and 3), that is to say, in contravention of clause (c) of Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes Act. He contended further that because the strike was illegal and violent, the lock-out declared in consequence of such illegal strike must not be deemed to be illegal. Mr. D. L. Sen Gupta, learned Counsel for the workmen, sought to repel this argument with the contention that the strike had no nexus with the dispute over overtime wages and payment for extra shift duty but was occasioned by the order of suspension imposed upon two workmen on November 18, 1968. In support of this contention he strongly relied upon the following statement in the written statement of the management:

"Para 15.... a deputation of hostile and agitated workmen came to see Mr. K. K. Mitra, the then Secretary of the firm. In the said meeting two workmen (Sk. Ibrahim and Sk. Sajid) shouted at the Secretary in a rude, hostile and unbecoming manner. The Secretary, therefore, asked them to leave his room but they refused to do so. Therefore, these two workmen were Chargesheeted, and suspended with full wages.

Para 16 In view of the suspension of the two workmen concerned as stated above, all the Measuring Porters and Gearmen stopped their normal work from 19th November 1968 without notice."

He also relied upon the following piece of evidence given by S. K. Nasibullah, who was examined on behalf of the workmen:

"On 19th, the Secretary suspended two of our members, Sk. Sajid and Sk. Ibrahim, both members of the Action Committee of the two Trade Unions of the workmen. Because of the order of suspension, we commenced strike. It will be untrue to say that we struck work because of our demand for extra shift duty."

9. I may at once point out that if the workman derived support from the written statement filed by the management, may also find support from the written statement filed by the workmen represented by the National Union of Waterfront Workers. I have hereinbefore set out paragraph 3 of the written statement of the National Union of Waterfront Workers. It will appear therefrom the workmen had been agitating over over-time wages and enhanced rate for extra booking and when they failed to get redress by constitutional agitation they "had to take recourse to a strike on November 19, 1968 and continued the same till December 3, 1968 when the company declared lock-out". In my reading, the agitation over over-time and extra shift wages was the basic cause of the strike. Its immediate cause was the suspension of Sk. Sajid and Sk. Ibrahim, the workmen who carried on noisy demonstration inside the office room of Mr. K. K. Mitra, the then Secretary.

10. The question then arises whether the strike without terminating the previous settlement was illegal. It is nobody's case that there was any express termination of the previous agreements (Ex. 1, 2 and 3). All that we get from a letter (Ex. 4) addressed by the Secretary of the Calcutta Licensed Measurers to the Assistant Labour Commissioner, on September 2, 1968, is:

"Hope you are aware that the workmen of M/s. Calcutta Licensed Measures are very agitated on the question of rate of overtime allowance for Sunday, holidays and extra bookings. The workmen and this Union

has demanded double rate of wages for extra booking including Sunday and holidays. All endeavour for a mutual settlement have failed and having found no other alternative the workmen have resolved to collectively refuse to accept the booking on Sunday, holiday and to extra booking on any day after 16th September, 1968, unless the dispute raised is mutually settled." (Underlined by me).

Whether the demand as mentioned in Ex. 4, was by way of a Charter of Demand or otherwise does not appear. The Assistant Labour Commissioner appears to have written the following letter (Ex. 5) dated September 4, 1968, to the Joint Secretary, National Union of Waterfront Workers:

"Please refer to the discussions the parties had in this office on 28th August 1968, over the above issues.

2. After prolonged discussion, as both the parties had divergent views about the propriety of raising the demand in view of term No. 7 of the Conciliation Settlement dated the 1st October 1964, it was decided that the issues whether the demand are covered under the said term shall be referred by this office to the government for clarification etc. While I was about to write to the government on this issue, your strike notice dated 2nd September 1968 has reached me and I find that the strike has been proposed over the same issues. As concurrently two disputes over the same issue cannot be processed, I am closing the dispute that was being dealt with in this office file bearing of even number over your letter No. ND/19/196/68, dated 8th August 1968 and separate notices of conciliation proceedings over your strike notice are under issue.
3. I may hardly emphasise the necessity for maintaining status-quo and avoiding the acceptance of extra bookings in the interest of maintaining congenial atmosphere and peace at the concern—particularly when I am seized of the matter and conciliation has already commenced in view of the strike notice."

It also appears that the Government of India did not think it proper to shorten the period of settlement and refer the dispute over over-time wages, etc. to adjudication (vide Ex. 6) the letter from the Government as set out hereunder:

"In continuation of this Ministry's letter No. 28/76/68-LR-III, dated the 23rd September 1968, on the subject above, I am directed to say that the Government of India do not find the dispute fit for reference to adjudication as the action of the management in denying the demand for increase in rates for overtime work and for extra casual bookings is not unjustified."

On the aforesaid facts, I have to find out whether the settlements remained binding on the workmen, who went on strike. Now, Section 19(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act reads:

"Such settlement shall be binding for such period as is agreed upon by the parties, and if no such period is agreed upon, for a period of six months (from the date on which the memorandum of settlement is signed by the parties to the dispute), and shall continue to be binding on the parties after the expiry of the period aforesaid, until the expiry of two months from the date on which a notice in writing of an intention to terminate the settlement is given by one of the parties to the other party or parties to the settlement."

Interpreting the sub-Section, a single Judge of the Calcutta High Court held, in the case of *Continental Commercial Co. (Private) Ltd. vs Their workmen* (1962) 1 LLJ 85, that Sub-section (2) of Section 19 of the Industrial Disputes Act, as it stood prior to its amendment by Act 36 of 1966 and as it stands after the amendment, did not and does not contemplate notice of the intention to terminate a settlement being given in a particular form. But Section 19(2) of the Act does not contemplate a tacit representation but an express representation physically in the form of writing terminating an agreement. A Charter of demand asking for revision of conditions of service, covered by a settlement, would only amount to tacit representation by the workmen not to remain bound any more by the settlement and would not serve the purposes of the Sub-section. It was further held that a notice under Section 19(2) of the Act could be waived by the party to whom the notice was to be sent, for example, when an employer took part in conciliation proceedings and never took objection in course of the conciliation that the old settlement was in force. In the facts of the instant case, there is nothing to show that the previous settlements w



expressly terminated. This is no Charter of demand, in this case, expressly terminating the previous settlements over over-time wages and extra shift payment, etc, and asking for more. The agitation over revision is only tacit representation of unwillingness to be bound by the previous settlements. Further, there is nothing in the conduct of the employers which would go to show that they had waived the notice of termination of the settlements. I therefore uphold the contention of Mr. Chowdhury that the strike was illegal. Thus, if the strike was illegal, the lockout declared in consequence thereof cannot be treated as illegal, because of the language of Sub-section (3) of Section 24.

11. Then again, there is no evidence that the strike commenced on November 19, 1968 was a peaceful strike in which the workers merely stayed away from their work. Mr. K. K. Mitra deposed in the case and he spoke of obstruction, assault and noisy demonstration by the workmen. I have no reason to disbelieve him without more. A strike followed by lawlessness is ample justification for declaration of a lock-out.

12. Even then, the question remains for me whether the lock-out commenced legally and on justifiable grounds on December 3, 1968 could be prolonged upto January 27, 1969. I have gone through the evidence in this case and I do not find evidence of lawlessness by the workmen after the first week of December 1968 and January 1969. Mr. D. L. Sen Gupta invited my attention to a decision of the Supreme Court in *Northern Dooars Tea Company Ltd. vs Workmen of Dem Dima Tea Estate*, (1964) 1 L.L.J., 436. That was a case in which there was a token strike and a long lock-out. In that context Gajendragadkar, J. (as he then was) observed (page 440):

"Besides, in declaring the lockout the appellant made it clear to the workmen that if they did not return to work the same day, the lockout would continue until the appellant was satisfied and received assurance that the workmen would behave in a disciplined manner when they resume work and that naturally meant negotiations which ultimately led to the settlement. In this settlement the respondents' union no doubt agreed to maintain industrial peace in the garden and said that it had no objection of the manager required and obtained verbal assurance from every individual worker that he would agree to abide by the standing order, by the lawful and just orders of the management to work diligently and to refer all disputes in future in the correct and constitutional manner as laid down by the law of the country. As a result of this agreement the appellant promised to reopen the garden with effect from 7 October 1957 and provide immediate employment to as many workers as possible and lay off the remainder in accordance with law, and withdraw the chargesheets issued to the nine factory workmen on 26th July 1957. *The tribunal took the view that in prolonging the period of the lockout with a view to obtain an oral assurance from each workman of his/her good behaviour, the appellant could not be said to have acted fairly and so it held that both in declaring the lockout and in continuing it until 6 October the appellant acted vindictively. In our opinion, this conclusion of the tribunal is well-founded.* In this connexion, it is significant that on 16 September the appellant did not open the gates and refused permission to the workmen to resume work. That is the effect of the evidence given by Lakhan Das (P. W. 1). His oral statement is corroborated by the communication made by the union to the respective authorities on 19 September 1967 (Ex. 13). Therefore, the grievance made by Sri Sastri that the tribunal should not have directed the appellants to pay to the respondent their wages during the period of the lock-out cannot be sustained. However in deciding the quantum of wages to be paid to the respondents, we cannot altogether ignore their conduct at the relevant time. That is why we would like to modify the order passed by the tribunal by directing that the respondents should be paid the half of their full wages for the period and that too, not from 13 September to 6 October but from 16 September to 6 October. We are making this modification because the token strike lasted for three days and we do not think the respondents are entitled to their wages during these days. 15 September was a holiday". (Underlined by me for emphasis).

Mr. Chowdhury, however, wanted to distinguish the case on the ground that in that case the strike was only for a few days but in the instant case the strike

was for longer duration. In my opinion the distinction does not make much difference. On the principle laid down by the Supreme Court, it is clear there should not be lockout for a longer period than necessary. In the instant case, after declaration of the lockout the management did nothing more. They waited for the day when the workmen must come down to their knees and beg to rejoin. That was not the proper attitude for the management. In the meantime, the workmen went about to see the management but to no effect (*vide* evidence of Nasibulla). The lockout was lifted only at Government intervention (*vide* Ex. 12). In my opinion, in the circumstances of the present case, the management prolonged the strike for much too long a time and the blame must be apportioned between the management and the workmen.

13. Mr. Chaudhuri argued that even after the lockout had been lifted, the workmen did not rejoin. That according to him showed the justification for continuance of the lockout. In this argument Mr. Chaudhuri is not right. The workmen refused to rejoin, because the management would not allow some workmen who had been charged with misconduct but not suspended to rejoin. The charges were later on withdrawn. Thus, the management created unnecessary complications and supplied fresh grounds to the workmen to stay away.

14. Since I hold that the management was not right in prolonging the lockout, they must pay some compensation to the workmen. I should not make it half and half, because there was enough justification for the declaration of the lockout. I therefore direct that the management shall pay 1/3 (one third) of the wages to the workmen for the period December 3, 1968 to January 27, 1969.

This is my award.

Dated, June 3, 1970.

(Sd.) B. N. BANERJEE,

Presiding Officer.

[No. 28/80/69-Fac.II/P&D.]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th June 1970

**S.O. 2186.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of New India Corporation, Calcutta and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the employers of Messrs New India Corporation, Calcutta, in terminating the service of Shri Subhas Chandra Bose, Jetty Sircar, with effect from 13th January, 1970, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. 72/8/70-P&D.]

#### CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 8th June 1970

**S.O. 2187.**—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. .... dated the 1st June, 1970 published in the Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India Extraordinary dated the 2nd June, 1965—

1. in item (ii) of sub-clause (1) of clause 33. for ‘Khamali’, read ‘Stevedore Mazdoor (Senior)’
2. in item (ii) of clause 35, for ‘(k) and (l)’, read ‘(k), (l) and (m)’

3. Item (2) of Schedule I shall be replaced by the following:—

- (a) Deck Foreman.
- (b) Hatch Foreman.
- (c) Winch Driver.
- (d) Sirdar
- (e) Mate.
- (f) Stevedore Mazdoor (Senior).
- (g) Stevedore Mazdoor (Junior).
- (h) Rigger.
- (i) Tally Clerk.
- (j) Salt Worker, Bagger and Stitcher.
- (k) General Mazdoor (Cargo).
- (l) General Purpose Mazdoor.
- (m) Gearman.

[No. 53/27/69-Fac. II.]

C. RAMDAS, Dy. Secy.

(Department of Labour and Employment)

*New Delhi, the 11th June 1970*

**S.O. 2188.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 3) Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Khelari, District Ranchi and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th June, 1970.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 3) AT DHANBAD

REFERENCE No. 57 of 1969

**PRESENT:**

Shri Sachidanand Sinha M.A.M.L., Presiding Officer.

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery Company (Private) Limited.

*Vs. .*

Their workmen.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For employers.*—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate and Member of Executive Committee, I.M. Federation.

*For workmen.*—Shri A. Das Gupta, Advocate and President, Coal Worker's Union.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal.

**STATE:** Bihar.

*Camp at Ranchi, the 23rd of May, 1970*

**AWARD**

1. The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery Company (Private) Limited Post Office Khelari, District Ranchi and their workmen, by its order No. 2/28/69-LRII dated the 21st of August, 1969 referred to this Tribunal under section 10(1)(d) of the industrial disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute

in respect of the matters specified in the schedule annexed thereto. The Schedule is extracted below:—

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether having regard to the financial capacity of Messrs Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Khelari, District Ranchi, the management is justified in not implementing the wages and other benefits to the workmen as recommended by the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry and as accepted by the Government with effect from 15th August, 1967. If not, to what relief, if any, are the workers entitled in respect of wages, dearness allowance and other benefits and from what date?"

2. The employers filed written statement on 3rd October 1969. Their case is that they have not implemented the Wage Board Recommendations for the reasons mentioned in paras 5, 6 and 12 of their written statement which are quoted below:—

"5. That it is submitted that the Colliery has been running at a loss since several years past and the employers will produce relevant documents for this purpose.

6. That with the cost of production, and the continuous loss suffered, it was not possible for the employers to implement the Wage Board Recommendations.

12. That it is submitted that the financial capacity of M/s. Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery Co. (P) Ltd. is not such as to enable the management to implement the wages and other benefits to the workmen as recommended by the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry".

3. The case of the management is that they had been paying to their workmen and employees the wages according to the Mazumdar Award and the Labour Appellate Tribunal decisions and even after paying the wages according to the above award and decisions, the management had been suffering heavy losses, and in spite of the continuous loss, the employers have implemented the Wage Board Recommendation regarding the monthly paid staff only, with effect from 1st July, 1969 and a flat increase of 10 per cent in the total emoluments to the weekly paid employees with effect from week beginning 23rd November, 1969. It was further submitted by them that they are informed that the neighbouring private owned collieries have not implemented the wage board recommendations and as such the present reference against this employer is a discriminatory one and is liable to be rejected on that ground also and in view of the submissions made above, there is no case against this employer either in law or in facts and the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

4. The President, Colliery Workers Union, Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery filed written statement on behalf of the workmen on 7th October 1969. Their case is that the Coal Wage Board Recommendations as accepted by the Central Government should be implemented by the management with effect from 15th August, 1967 and that the management has got financial capacity for implementing the wages and other benefits to the workmen as recommended by the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry. It was mentioned on behalf of the Union that the management is raising coal to the tune of about 15000 tons per month. It was stated that the neighbouring Manki Colliery No. 2 which is smaller colliery and raising of which is only 4 to 5 thousand tons, have implemented the recommendations of the Wage Board and similarly Bachra Colliery of N.C.D.C. have also implemented the recommendations of the Wage Board.

5. In their written statement they have further stated that the management is also not paying the overtime wages at double of the ordinary rate to its workmen. There are only 150 quarters and even in those quarters there are no arrangements for water and electricity and they are in dilapidated conditions. The workers are also not being paid lead and lift allowance and also under-ground allowance. All the workers are also not made to contribute towards Coal Mines Provident Fund. Even the quarterly bonus is not paid in-time and they are not giving the proper medical facilities to their workmen.

6. The Union examined as many as 15 witnesses. WW-1 to WW-14 are the workmen of this colliery and WW-15 Sri Surajdeo Sharma is the acting President of the Union. In their oral statement these workmen have stated that they are getting less wages than what they ought to have been paid according to the recommendations of the Wage Board. In their evidence they have made a general statement to the effect that they are not getting any sick leave, sick allowance, train fare and that they are not getting overtime wages at double of the ordinary rates, and that they are

Not getting under ground allowance or lead and lift allowance. They have further stated that they have not sufficient numbers of quarters and even in those quarters there are no arrangements for electricity and water and that they are in dilapidated condition. A large number of workers are still temporary and do not contribute towards the Coal Mines Provident Fund. WW-15 Sri Surajdeo Sharma stated in his evidence that the workmen of this colliery are not getting proper wages according to the recommendations of the Central Wage Board and the management has also not made proper categorisation of the workmen and that the workers are also not properly designated. The leaders, trammers and other piece-rated workers are not getting wages as per recommendation of the Wage Board and other workers also viz. Pump Khalasi, Haulage Khalasi, Lamp Khalasi and drivers are also not getting wages as per recommendations of the Wage Board. He further stated that in this colliery workers are not made permanent even after service of several years running to 7 to 8 years and even they are not contributing towards their Provident Fund. The management has also not provided with sufficient housing facilities. According to him there are 750 workers in this colliery but there are only 150 quarters. The Union has also filed nine items of documents and they are marked as Ext. W-1 to W-9.

7. On behalf of the management 2 witnesses were examined viz. MW-1 Bhanu Shanker Rawal and MW-2 Sri Bindeshwer Singh, the manager of the colliery. MW-1 is accountant in the Head Office of the Colliery. The management has also filed 8 items of documents and they are marked as Ext. M-1 to M-8.

8. It is admitted that the management has not implemented the Wage Board Recommendations on the ground that their financial capacity is not such as to enable the management to implement the Wages and other benefits to their workmen as per recommendations of the Central Wage Board. In order to indicate their financial capacity the management have mainly relied on exhibits M-1 to M-4, the audited balance sheet for the years 1965 to 1968 and these exhibits are sheet anchor of their case.

It was submitted before me on behalf of the management replying on Exts. M-1 to M-4 that in the year 1965 the management was running into loss. Ext. M-1 the audited balancesheet for the year 1965 shows that in the year 1965 the net loss was Rs. 1,16,792.69 and the loss in the previous year was Rs. 70,841.24 and thus the total loss was Rs. 1,87,633.17. Relying upon Ext. M-2 it was argued on behalf of the management that the net loss in the year 1966 was Rs. 2,54,386.58 and the total loss in the year 1966 came to Rs. 4,42,014.75. Ext. M-3, the audited balance sheet for the year 1967 shows that in that year there was net profit of Rs. 550.65 and thus the total loss amounted to Rs. 4,41,464.10. Ext. M-4 the audited balance sheet for the year 1968 shows that in that year there was a net profit of Rs. 3,28,643.75 and thus the total loss reduced to Rs. 1,25,558.45 and therefore, the management was not in a financial position to implement the recommendations of the Wage Board.

9. On the other hand it was submitted before me on behalf of the union that the financial capacity of the management is sound and the net profit is high and they have the financial capacity to implement the recommendations of the Wage Board. Sri Anil Das Gupta, appearing on behalf of the union has submitted that the financial capacity as shown by the management in their audited balance sheet is not correct. The colliery as a matter of fact, was running in profit. The audited balance sheets are wrong and they are manipulated for the purpose of this case, and therefore, no reliance can be placed on these audited balance sheets as they are faked documents. It was further submitted before me that the recitals in these documents are false and fabricated. It was further submitted to me that they are neither the original audited balance sheets nor authenticated copies duly certified by the legal and competent authority. Therefore, it was submitted before me that as such these are not legally admissible. In short the stand taken by the union is that these balance sheets are not genuine and are fictitious and forged documents, and no reliance can be placed on them.

10. MW-2 Sri B. S. Rawal, is Accountant in Head Office of this colliery and he has made statement about these audited balance sheets Exts. M-1 to M-4. He has stated in his evidence that upto the year 1968 the net loss was Rs. 1,25,558.45 and according to him during the year 1965 to 1968 the colliery was running at a loss and therefore, the management was not in a position to implement the recommendations of the Wage Board.

11. According to the Union these audited balance sheets are faked documents. MW-1 in his cross-examination has stated that Ext. M-1 to M-4 do not contain the signature of the Chartered Accountant nor it contain the seal and signature

of their management showing that these are the true copies. MW-2 Sri B. Singh the Manager of the colliery also does not speak about the genuineness and authenticity of these balance sheets (Exts. M-1 to M-4). In this case he had made the following statement in his cross-examination:

"The balance sheets are prepared in the Head Office and therefore, I am not in a position to explain any item of expenditure. I cannot explain the item loading, demurrage charges etc. shown in profit and loss account statements (Exts. M-1 to M-4)."

13. Mr. A. Das Gupta, appearing on behalf of the Union has taken up almost these audited balance sheets.

13. Mr. A. Das Gupta, appearing on behalf of the Union has taken up almost all the items of expenditure and has tried to show that the figures of these items are false and faked. In the year 1965 the coal raising expenses have been shown to Rs. 8,42,945.35 (schedule E of Ext. M-1). But the management has shown separately a sum of Rs. 1,13,244.35 as loading and demurrage charges. It was submitted before me that the coal raising expenses has been shown twice over (i) under the heading of coal raising expenses and (ii) under the heading of loading and demurrage charges. Similarly in the year 1966 the coal raising expenses has been shown to be Rs. 7,97,272.06 and again Rs. 89,164.55 have been shown as loading and demurrage charges and therefore, it was pointed out to me that the management has shown the cost of coal raising twice (i) under the heading of coal raising expenses and other under the heading of load and demurrage expenses. It has also been pointed out to me that the cost of coal raising expenses as shown in Ext. M-1 to M-4 do not tally with the coal raising expenses as given in Ext. M-5, the annual return for the year 1965 to 1968. For example, the cost of coal raising in the year 1965 according to Ext. M-1, the audited balance sheet, was Rs. 8,42,945.45 whereas according to Ext. M-5(1) the cost of coal raising was Rs. 8,52,710.26. Similarly according to Ext. M-2 the cost of coal raising was Rs. 7,97,272.06 whereas according to Ext. M-5(2) the cost of coal raising was Rs. 8,42,618.72.

14. It was further submitted before me that Ext. M-1 to M-4 do not show the cess paid by the colliery under the Coal Mines Welfare Fund Act and Rules. In this respect MW-1 Sri B. Singh has stated in his evidence as follows:—

"We pay the levy to the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation according to law. We have not filed any paper showing the amount of money paid by this colliery to Coal Mines Welfare Organization towards levy. We keep account for the amount for the levy paid by this colliery but we have not filed those registers."

15. Therefore, these balance sheets Ext. M-1 to M-4 do not contain all the items of expenditure.

16. It was further submitted before me that the amount shown as cost towards Dhawrah building is fictitious. In this connection my attention has been drawn to Ext. M-4 where a sum of Rs. 12,897.25 has been shown as addition during the year 1968 in the Dhawrah building repairing. A large number of witnesses have been examined on behalf of the Union and they have stated on oath that the dhawrahs are in a dilapidated condition and therefore, it was submitted before me that the expenses shown as additions in Dhawrah building is fictitious.

17. Similarly it has been pointed out to me that the management has shown a huge amount towards loans and advance to Sundry Debtors. For example in the year 1965 Rs. 30,232.27 has been shown as loan and advance towards Sundry Debtors. It was submitted before me that this figure is fictitious.

18. MW-1 Sri B. S. Rawal has stated in his evidence in connection with the payment of income-tax as follows:—

"It is correct to say that the income-tax for the year 1962, 63 and 64 as shown in the balance sheet of the year 1968, indicate that the colliery had made profits in the year 1962, 63 and 64 for which income-tax was paid, as per income-tax assessment. In the balance sheet for the year 1965 to 1967 there is no mention of income-tax assessment or income-tax payment for those years."

19. Therefore, I find that the balance sheets Ext. M-1 to M-4 are not the original balance sheets nor they are authenticated copies duly certified by the legal and competent authority. Moreover, the recitals made therein also do not inspire confidence. The recitals are not truthfully made and they appear to be fabricated. Therefore, no reliance can be placed on these balance sheets.

20. In para 2 of the written statement of the union it has been stated that the monthly raising of coal in this colliery is about 15 thousand tonnes and that the management has got the financial capacity to implement the recommendations of Wage Board. MW-2 is Sri B. Singh, the manager of the colliery. In his statement he has stated that in this colliery there are 2 first class and one second class managers. He has further stated that according to Coal Mines Regulation there should be one 1st class manager in the mine raising coal to the extent of 5,000 and above per month and that when the raising is 7,500 and above then the management has to employ one more 2nd class mine manager and when the raising exceeds 20,000 another 1st class manager is required to be appointed. Therefore, according to his statement the raising of this colliery exceeds 20,000 and therefore, there are two first class and one second class mine managers in this colliery. It was submitted before me on behalf of the management that since this is a gassy mine and therefore, in this colliery there are two first class managers and one second class manager. But this plea of the management does not appear to be satisfactory.

21. MW-1 Sri B. S. Rawal, the Accountant has stated in his evidence that in the register of the colliery daily raisings are entered and that the raisings and despatch figures are entered in the relevant registers. But the management has not filed the raising and despatch registers and therefore, adverse inference must be drawn against the management for not filing the raising and despatch registers.

22. The circumstances go to show that in this colliery the raising is at least 15,000 tones per month. Even according to the audited balance sheets for the year 1967-68 Ext. M-3 and M-4 the colliery has made profit in those years.

23. Ext. M-7 is the settlement dated 21st November 1969. Ext. M-7 shows that the management has fully implemented the recommendations of the Central Wage Board with effect from the week ending 23rd November, 1969. Ext. M-8 is the certificate of the Regional Labour Commissioner, Dhanbad stating that this colliery has fully implemented the recommendations of the Wage Board. It is dated 15th of December, 1969. Ext. M-7 deed of settlement and the certificate of the Regional Labour Commissioner (Ext. M-8) are subsequent to the date of reference. Exts. M-7 and M-8 only show that at present the colliery has the financial capacity to implement the recommendations of the Wage Board.

24. The point therefore, for consideration is whether on the date of reference i.e. 21st August 1969 the management had financial capacity to implement the recommendations of the Wage Board?

25. In this reference I find that the audited balance sheets Ext. M-1 to M-4 for the years 1965 to 1968 are not reliable and it will be unsafe to make any finding on the balance sheets Ext. M-1 to M-4. The management has not filed the raising and despatch registers and therefore, an adverse inference against the management must be drawn for not filing the raising and despatch registers and I am therefore, inclined to hold that the raising of this colliery is about 15,000 tones per month. Even according to the audited balance sheets for the year 1967-68 the Company has made profits in those years. The management in their written statement have admitted that they have partially implemented the recommendations of the Wage Board in the months of July and August, 1969 and that Ext. M-7 the deed of settlement shows that they have fully implemented the recommendations of the Wage Board.

26. On behalf of the management a Supreme Court case of workmen of Sri Bajrang Jute Mills Ltd. Vs. Bajrang Jute Mills Ltd., reported in Vol. 37 F. J., page 253 has been cited. But the facts of this case are quite different and it has got no relevancy in the present reference. That case has simply stated what principles are to be followed in arriving at the fair wages for an industry by Wage Board.

27. I therefore, hold that having regard to the financial capacity of M/s. Karanpura Dewarkhand Colliery (Private) Limited, the management is not justified in not implementing the wages and other benefits to the workmen as recommended by the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry and as accepted by the Government with effect from 15th August, 1967.

28. The workers are accordingly entitled in respect of wages, dearness allowance and other benefits with effect from 15th August, 1967. The arrears so calculated may be spread over 12 months in the year in equal instalments.

29. This is my award. It may be submitted to the Central Government under section 19 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd) SACHIDANAND SINHA,  
Presiding Officer.

[No. 2/28/69-LR-II.]

New Delhi, the 12th June 1970

S.O. 2189.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Nagpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Ghugus Colliery, Post Office Manikpur, District Chandrapur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 3rd June, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT NAGPUR

REFERENCE (CGT) No. 6 of 1969

PRESENT:

Sri G. V. Deo, B.A., LL.B., Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

1. M/s. Ballarpur Collieries Company, Temple Road, Nagpur.
  2. The Mine Manager, Ghugus Colliery, Post Office Manikpur, District Chandrapur—Employers First Party.
- Versus*

Shri Pandurang Sitaram Underground Trammer, Ghugus Colliery, Post Office Manikpur, District Chandrapur—Employee Second Party.

APPEARANCES:

For Employers First Party—Shri Gadkari, Officer in Personnel Dept.  
For Workman Second Party—Absent.

STATE: Maharashtra.

INDUSTRY: Colliery.

Nagpur Dated the 28th April, 1970

AWARD

This is a reference under Section 10(7)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, regarding a dispute between the Management of the Ghugus Colliery and its workman Shri Pandurang Sitaram. The dispute referred for adjudication is:

"Whether the action of the management of Ghugus Colliery Post Office Manikpur, District Chandrapur in dismissing Shri Pandurang Sitaram Underground Trammer with effect from the 24th April, 1969 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The contention of the employee was that he was unwell and was hospitalised from 14th October, 1968 to 20th February, 1969. On his discharge from the hospital the Civil Surgeon had issued a certificate in his favour recommending that he should be given light work. The Management, however, did not give him any light work with the result his health went down and he was again on leave from 10th March, 1969 for a few days. He then again represented to the Management for being given light work and as his request was not complied with the matter was taken up by him with the Conciliation Officer. The Conciliation proceedings, however, were not fruitful and on 24th March, 1969 he was served with a chargesheet for being absent without permission. Thereafter by an order dated 24th April, 1969 he was dismissed from service. It was contended that there was no domestic enquiry and that the dismissal was illegal.

3. The main defence of the Management was that the employee had been absent without permission and had committed misconduct under Standing Order No. 21(15). A chargesheet was, therefore, issued to him and he was informed about the date and time of the domestic enquiry which was to be held against him. The employee, however, remained absent and consequently the domestic enquiry proceeded *ex parte* against him. In the domestic enquiry the employee was found to have committed misconduct under Standing Order No. 21(15) and was, therefore, dismissed from service. It was alleged that the aforesaid finding of the management could not be set aside by this Tribunal as it was not perverse.

4. On the date of hearing in this Court the employee remained absent and the matter, therefore, proceeded *ex parte* against him. On behalf of the management, the Labour Officer Shri R. K. Singh was examined to prove that the enquiry held



against the employee was in accordance with the principles of natural justice and that the misconduct with which the employee had been charged had been duly proved. The management has filed the relevant enquiry papers and also the extracts of the Attendance Registers to indicate that the employee Pandurang Sitaram had been absent without permission for more than 10 days and had thus committed misconduct under Standing Order No. 21(15). In the circumstances the dismissal of the employee by the management was perfectly justified and the employee is not entitled to claim any relief.

5. For reasons given above I make an Award that the action of the management in dismissing the employment of Pandurang Sitaram from 24th April, 1969 was justified and the employee is not entitled to any relief. Costs in these proceedings shall be borne by the parties as incurred.

(Sd.) G. V. Dho  
Presiding Officer,  
[No. 3/5/69-LRII.]

**S.O. 2190.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 3) Dhanbad in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Jagu Hazam, General Mazdoor, Balihari Colliery of Messrs Balihari Colliery Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th May, 1970.

# CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 3) AT DHANBAD

COMPLAINT No. 6 of 1968

## PRESENT:

Shri Sachidanand Sinha, M.A.M.L., Presiding Officer.

## PARTIES:

Shri Jagu Hazam, General Mazdoor, Balihari Colliery of M/s. Balihari Colliery Company (P) Limited—Complainant.

*Versus*

M/s. Balihari Colliery Company (Private) Limited.—Opp. Party.

## APPEARANCES:

*For complainant*—Shri S. V. Achariar, General Secretary, Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

*For Opp. Party*—S/Sri S. S. Mukherjee, and B. Joshi, Advocates

INDUSTRY: Coal.

STATE: Bihar

*Dhanbad, dated the 5th of May, 1970*

## AWARD

1. This is a complaint under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by one Sri Jagu Hazam, General Mazdoor against the employer in relation to the Balihari Colliery, alleging that the opposite party has been guilty of contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Act.

2. The case of the complainant is that an industrial dispute regarding retrenchment of 376 workmen of Balihari Colliery is pending in reference No. 22 of 1968 before this Tribunal. The petitioner Sri Jagu Hazam is a member of Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh. Reference No. 22 of 1968 is being sponsored by the Hindustan Khan Mazdoor Sangh. The petitioner was dismissed on 29th July, 1967 while reference No. 22 of 1968 was pending before this Tribunal. The opposite party did not make any application before this Tribunal for approval of the action of the management in dismissing the petitioner Sri Jagu Hazam.

3. According to the petitioner he was innocent and had not committed any offence or misconduct. The petitioner was served with a chargesheet dated 6th April, 1967. The charge was that he remained absent from duty continuously

since 7th March, 1967 upto this date i.e. for more than ten days without satisfactory cause and therefore, he had committed misconduct under clause 29(16) of the Standing Order.

4. The petitioner submitted his written explanation on 13th April, 1967 denying the charges. According to the petitioner no enquiry was held and the dismissal of the petitioner was thoroughly mala fide and was a case of victimisation. The petitioner was an active member of Hindustan Kham Mazdoor Sangh and since he refused to become a member of pocket union backed by the management the petitioner was falsely implicated in a fabricated charge and has been victimised.

5. The action of the opposite party in withdrawing application under section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for approval of dismissal of the petitioner on the 8th of November, 1967 was mala fide. In short, the case of the petitioner is that he was dismissed from service on 29th July, 1967 while reference No. 22 of 1968 was pending before this Tribunal and thus the opposite party has contravened the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

6. The opposite party has filed the written statement on 28th December, 1968. On facts it was stated that the chargesheet dated 6th April, 1967 was issued to the applicant and he was suspended during enquiry. The applicant submitted a reply to the chargesheet dated 13th April, 1967 denying the charges. The notice dated 3rd of May, 1967 was issued to the workman fixing the enquiry on 8th May, 1967 at 3 P.M. in the Director's office. The applicant workmen, however, refused to attend the enquiry and hence he did not attend the departmental enquiry fixed on 8th May, 1967. It was held in his absence. In the departmental enquiry the misconduct mentioned in the chargesheet was satisfactorily established and the complainant was dismissed by letter dated 28th July, 1967 with effect from 29th July, 1967.

7. Reference No. 22 of 1968 was disposed of by an award dated 20th September, 1968. In this reference the opposite party under misapprehension of law had filed an application under section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for approval of dismissal of the petitioner. But the same was withdrawn by the opposite party on the 8th of November, 1968.

8. According to the opposite party the complainant was not a workman concerned in the reference No. 22 of 1968 and consequently the employers have not violated the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and as such the present application is not legally maintainable. It was alleged that the dismissal of the complainant was legal, bona fide and based on proved misconducts. According to the opposite party they had also not violated any of the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in dismissing the complainant. Since the complainant was not a workman concerned in reference No. 22 of 1968, the present application is not maintainable.

9. On behalf of the opposite party 2 witnesses viz. MW-1 Sri Amrindra Kumar Mazumdar and MW-2 Sri A. K. Mazumdar were examined. MW-1 is Head Clerk and MW-2 is attendance clerk in Balihari Colliery. On behalf of the opposite party 12 items of documents are exhibited and are marked Ext. M-1 to M-12. On behalf of the complainant one witness viz. Sri Jagu Hazam was examined.

10. The point for consideration is whether the opposite party have contravened the provision of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?

11. There are certain admitted facts. Reference No. 22 of 1968 was originally referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad by the Central Government's order No. 2/73/66-LRII dated the 9th of May, 1966 and thereafter it was transferred to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad by the Central Government's order No. 8/25/67-LRII dated the 8th of May, 1967. By the subsequent order No. 8/71/68-LRII dated the 13th of August, 1968, the Central Government transferred the dispute to the Tribunal. The reference was disposed of by the award dated 20th of September, 1968. The applicant was dismissed on 29th July, 1967. The opposite party had filed an application under section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for the approval of the dismissal of the petitioner but the same was later on withdrawn by the opposite party on the 8th of November, 1968. Therefore, the case of the applicant was that he was dismissed on 29th July, 1967 while the reference No. 22 of 1968 was pending before this Tribunal.

12. Before me the preliminary point was taken that the concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam was not a workman concerned with the dispute which was in

question in reference No. 22 of 1968. It was not necessary for the management to file an application under section 33(2)(b). It was therefore, submitted by the opposite party that the present application under section 33A is not maintainable.

13. The concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam was dismissed on the 29th of July, 1967. At that time reference No. 22 of 1968 was pending before this Tribunal. The case of the opposite party is that Sri Jagu Hazam was not a workman concerned with this dispute. Reference No. 22 of 1968 was for justification of retrenchment in respect to 376 workmen. In that case the management rescinded the retrenchment in respect to 127 workmen and the union agreed in respect to the retrenchment of the remaining 249 workmen and they received their retrenchment compensation. The name of the concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam appears at Serial No. 123 of the order of reference. The award (Ext. M-2) in reference No. 22 of 1968 shows that the concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam whose name appears in sl. No. 91 of list A was the workman who has taken back in service.

14. The point for determination is whether the concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam may be said to have been connected in the dispute in reference No. 22 of 1968 which was pending before this Tribunal?

15. The law on this subject is laid down by two important decisions of the Supreme Court in *New India Motors Private Limited V. K. T. Morris* [1960—(I) L.L.J. page 551] and *Digwadih Colliery V. Ramji Singh* [1964—(II) L.L.J.] page 143. The combined effect of these two decisions of Supreme Court is that there must be some common feature in the nature of the dispute in the two cases which should serve as connecting link thereby rendering the workmen in the latter case also, workmen concerned in the dispute in the earlier case. In other words the mere fact that the same union has taken up the cause of the two workmen or else that by virtue of S. 18(3)(b) of the Act all workmen may be bound by the award in the earlier dispute may not suffice unless there is some other common feature in the two Disputes.

16. In the chargesheet dated 6th April, 1967 that was issued to Sri Jagu Hazam, the defence of Sri Jagu Hazam was that he was innocent and that he was being victimised for his trade union activities. There is no question of victimization in respect to the concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam in reference No. 22 of 1968 as the opposite party had rescinded retrenchment in this case and agreed to take him back in service.

17. Therefore, the petitioner, Sri Jagu Hazam was not the workman connected with the dispute in reference No. 22 of 1968.

18. The opposite party had filed an application under section 33(2) (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for approval but the same was ultimately withdrawn by the opposite party on 8th November, 1968. According to the opposite party they have filed the application under section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 under misapprehension. There is nothing to prevent the employers from withdrawing the application made under proviso of section 33(2)(b) when the employers find that the application has been made under misapprehension.

19. In this view of the evidence the concerned workman Sri Jagu Hazam was not a workman connected with the dispute which was in question in reference No. 22 of 1968. It was not necessary for the management to file an application for approval of the punishment by the Tribunal under section 33(2)(b). Therefore, this application under section 33A is not maintainable.

20. The complaint under section 33A is held to be non-maintainable and my award therefore is that this complaint is not maintainable. Let it be submitted to the Central Government.

(Sd.) SACHIDANAND SINHA,  
Presiding Officer.  
[No. 8/84/70-LRII.]

#### ORDER

*New Delhi, the 8th June 1970*

**S.O. 2191.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Star Construction and Transport Company, Sankar West Salem District and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Thiru S. Swamikkannu as Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal.

**SCHEDULE**

Whether Messrs Star Construction and Transport Company Sankari were justified in promoting Shri Ponnuswamy, superseding Shri Natarajan who was senior to him in service? If not, to what relief is Shri Natarajan entitled?

[No. 12(13)/70-LR-IV.]

T. K. RAMACHANDRAN, Under Secy.